The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1893.

The Week.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND, with characteristic bluntness and force, held the obstructionists of the Senate up to public view in their true light in the following passage of his address at the Capitol centennial exercises on Monday:

"If representatives who here assemble to make laws for their fellow-countrymen forget the duty of broad and disinterested patriotism, and legislate in prejudice and passion, or in behalf of sectional or selfish interests, the time when the corner-stone of our Capitol was laid and the circumstances surrounding it will not be worth commemorating."

There is nothing behind the delay in the Senate except "sectional and selfish interests," and the whole country understands that fact perfectly. The President speaks in this instance, as he has spoken in so many others, for the whole people, and it will not be many days before the partisans of various kinds who are vainly opposing the inevitable accomplishment of repeal will find this out.

The anti-repealers are still filling the air in Washington with rumors of difficulties in the way of unconditional repeal. They are sure that there will have to be a compromise of some sort, and they are finding great comfort in the partisan disturbance which has been precipitated, quite foolishly, in the House over the Federal election laws. Why any Democratic member of the House should think that the present was a favorable or necessary time to raise this bitterly partisan issue, we are unable to comprehend. Nothing but a traditional propensity to blunder can account for Mr. Tucker's proceedings. But at the same time we are not prepared to believe that there is in the Senate any Republican who will be capable of the ludicrous conduct of changing his intention to vote for repeal of the Silver-Purchase Law because the Democrats of the House are proposing to repeal the Federal election laws. He would have a nice time explaining his vote to his constituents were he to do so.

It will be wise for the business world to view with equanimity the noisy demonstrations which will be kept up in Washington till the Senate is brought to a vote, for there is nothing in them but the bluster of despair. There are at least forty-eight Senators, the Philadelphia *Ledger's* Washington correspondent declares, who will vote down all amendments and compromises and insist upon unconditional repeal. That is a clear majority of eleven, and the *Evening Post's* correspondent's estimate, which is similar to that of the President, puts the majority in favor of repeal on the final vote at from 20 to 25. Under these circumstances all talk about the obstacles in the way of repeal, whether the source be the silver attorneys on the floor of the Senate or in the lobby, or the high-tariff fanatics who would rather see the repeal defeated than have the tariff reformed, or the Democratic Cleveland haters who care for nothing in the world so much as the failure of any policy that he advocates, or the champions of the defunct Force Bill—all such talk is equally inconsequential. There is nothing within the power of the opponents of repeal except delay, and they are exhausting that power with every day's use of it. It is a great pity that they cannot be brought up with a round turn at once, but that their doom is sealed cannot for a moment be questioned.

The desperate condition of the cause of bimetallism is indicated by the proposal of Senator Faulkner. So far as we know, this is about the only intelligible plan that has been presented for the use of both metals as actual currency, and it has the merit—although this will not recommend it to the advocates of free-silver coinage—of not being dishonest. But regarded as a practical scheme, it is astonishing. In the first place, it proposes to change the customs of the vast majority of our people by compelling them to carry coin in their pockets instead of paper money. It is true that other peoples are accustomed to carry about an assortment of precious metals, but the American people is not used to this practice, and it is a serious matter to face the sentiment expressed in the classical *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*. In the second place, his proposal would bring on the dreadful evils which so affect the imagination of bimetallists, arising from there not being enough gold to go around. By the withdrawal of all paper money except the old greenbacks of denominations under $10 from circulation, gold coins of the denomination of half-eagles and quarter-eagles would be forced into use. No one would carry in his pocket five pounds of silver when a quarter of a pound of gold would do the work just as well, and the result would be a sharp demand for gold. But this is the very bugbear of the bimetallists converted into a dire reality. There is no very fierce struggle for gold at present, but if we are actually going to use it in place of our five-dollar and two-dollar and one-dollar notes, there may be something of a scramble. This, of course, is upon the supposition that the "parity of the metals" is to be maintained; that is, that any one tendering the United States Treasury a silver dollar will be able to get a gold dollar in exchange, or at least that all dues to the Government may be paid in silver. Otherwise Mr. Faulkner's proposal means the silver standard. Again, we see that this measure provides no revenue for the purchase of silver, nor does it provide any means for putting in circulation $200,000,000 more silver dollars. It really amounts to nothing but the Bland Act of 1878, with an added provision intended to make people carry silver dollars in their pockets, and with a promise of the termination of the folly after a few years. But as the country is sick to death of it now, this promise has little cheer.

A proposition well worth considering is that introduced in the House last week providing for the annexation of the Territory of Utah to the State of Nevada. The present condition of Nevada is a reproach to our system of government. It has two members of the United States Senate, and one of the House of Representatives, although its population has been dwindling for years, and had sunk as low as only 45,761 souls in 1890. Utah, on the other hand, is growing steadily and rapidly, the increase in population between 1880 and 1890 having been almost 50 per cent., and the total in 1890 having been 207,905, or more than four times Nevada's. Probably by this time the number of inhabitants is not far short of a quarter of a million. The time is rapidly approaching when Utah must cease to be a Territory, and there could be no better way of its gaining the advantages of Statehood than through a union with Nevada. There would then be one commonwealth which would always be sure of a population large enough to justify the prerogatives of a State, while the scandal of Nevada's condition grows worse year by year.

We regret to observe that there is a disagreement between Mr. McKinley and the *Tribune* as to the desirability of "cheapness." The former stands manfully by his original position, first proclaimed in 1890, that "cheap and nasty go together," that "cheap merchandise means cheap men, and cheap men mean a cheap country," for he said in his speech last week at Akron:

"They [the people] have had quite enough of the 'cheap' era which was ushered in by the Democratic victory. They will soon discover, if they have not done so already, that 'cheapness' is not the highest aim of American citizenship."

The *Tribune*, with that catholicity in editing which distinguishes it, commends the speech as a whole in one extremely able and luminous leading article, and in another leading article, equally able and luminous, only a column's distance away from the first, claims that McKinley pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tection has given us the very "cheapness" that McKinley denounces, saying:

"When Mr. Cobden was advocating free trade in England fifty years ago, his great argument was that prices would be cheapened, and that the working classes would be fully employed at higher wages. The tariff hearings are demonstrating that both of these objects have been secured in the United States under protection."

It is very plain from Mr. McKinley's latest statement of his silver position that he has changed it very little from what it was in February, 1891, when he said in a speech at Toledo: "During all of his [Cleveland's] years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own great products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold." Last week he said:

"We do not want to strike down either gold or silver. We want to use both metals; but we insist now, as we have always insisted, that the one shall be at a parity with the other, to the end that we may have the use of both; that each shall be the equal of the other intrinsically, as well as in legal-tender and in debt-paying power. The silver product of the country, one of the most important we have, *should not be discriminated against*, but some plan should be devised for its utilization as a money which will insure, not the displacement of gold, but the safe and *full use of both*, as exchanges among the people."

There is very little difference between that kind of twaddle and the "defence of silver" which Peffer, Stewart, Teller, Jones, and Wolcott are making in the Senate. McKinley has weakened the force of his indictment somewhat by changing "dishonoring" to "discriminating against," but otherwise he is unshakably for silver.

What civil war is doing in the way of cutting off our coffee supplies from Brazil, Mr. Harrison's proclamation of retaliatory duties against Colombia, Venezuela, and Hayti has been doing all along. If those countries were free to send us the coffee they would like to, the present blockade in Brazil would afford them a fine chance to make extra large shipments and make good the Brazilian shortage. But we have deliberately shut ourselves off from that mode of relief. Coffee-consumers feel the Brazilian war very keenly, and are hoping that it will soon be over, so that they can get their coffee as cheap as before; but we have never seen any considerable indignation on their part on account of the arbitrary tax which did what they now lament to see war doing. The whole thing is a rather neat reminder of the way customs duties act, and are designed by protectionists to act, precisely like war. Indeed, it is a well-settled principle with protectionist expounders of economic history that there are only two possible explanations of an era of prosperity—protective taxes or war taxes. Mr. Blaine was the pioneer here, and his discovery that the Mexican war was all that kept the country from going to ruin under the revenue tariff of 1846 had a great run. Since then it has become axiomatic that, if the country was prosperous at any given time, the cause was a protective tariff, or, if that did not exist, then the equivalent blessing of a bloody and long-continued war.

It is pleasant to remember, in reading the account of the "Cherokee boom," that this must be the last of these chapters of mingled childishness and savagery. The public lands are now all opened to settlement, and there will, therefore, be no more rushes into new territory. The historian of the future, who will know that land has been a drug in the market on this continent for two hundred years, and can be had almost for the asking in all but a few favored localities, will be sorely puzzled by the Oklahoma and Cherokee "booms," unless he is familiar with the American passion for speculation—that is, for getting hold of something to be unloaded rapidly on somebody else. If he imagines the boomers to be intending cultivators of the soil, how absurd the sneer at the slowness and conservatism of the agricultural mind, with which our literature is filled, will seem to him. How different the mounted boomer, galloping to the scene of his projected toil, will seem from the dull, plodding farmer of contemporary fiction and journalism.

There is something very startling in the increase of that form of lawlessness known as lynching in the South. It has three distinguishing features: (1) the victims are always negroes; (2) the murderers are never punished; (3) simple murder often fails to satisfy the lynching parties, and they resort to torture and such forms of mutilation as would be expected only of our most savage Indians. Last Friday morning we had the account of the lynching of two men and two women, negroes, in Mississippi. A white man's family had, it was charged, been poisoned. Suspicion pointing to one negro, he was arrested, but was lynched by hanging before the inquest was concluded. The two women were discharged by the Coroner's jury, but were hanged at once. A second negro man, against whom there was suspicion, was found hanging to a tree the next morning. Monday's story, which comes from Louisiana, tells of four negroes killed by a mob because they would not disclose, if they could, the hiding-place of a negro murderer. There is the less excuse for these murders in the Southern States because in all of them the machinery of the law is in the hands of white men, and if the accused negroes are guilty, the law furnishes an adequate means for their punishment. There remains, however, in the South a feeling that punishment under due process of law is too dignified for a negro accused of a crime committed against a white man. A Southern correspondent of the *Evening Post*, discussing a few weeks ago the reasons why the Southern States attract so few immigrants, placed the frequency of lynching at the head of the list of causes. It may be that not until the South learns that lawlessness is a pecuniary loss, will public sentiment suffice to put an end to this form of it.

The brutality of our system of dismissing officials in the civil service receives another signal illustration in the treatment of Henry A. Thomas, Superintendent of Mails in the Boston Post-office. Mr. Thomas entered the office as a clerk in 1873, at the age of seventeen, was promoted to the Superintendency of Mails in 1889, and soon afterwards was offered the position of Superintendent of Foreign Mails at Washington, which he declined. No complaint has ever been made that he was not an efficient officer, but it is asserted that he has been so offensive in his political activity outside of the office as to forfeit any claim to retention. We do not enter upon this phase of the case. Indeed, for our present purpose, it may be admitted that there was ground for not continuing him permanently in the place. What we call attention to now is the manner of his dismissal, which was in this form, the notice being received on a Friday, to take effect on the following Sunday:

"POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT
RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
WASHINGTON, D. C., Sept. 14, 1893.

"*Henry A. Thomas, Superintendent of Mails:*

"SIR: An order has been issued discontinuing your pay and services as Superintendent of Mails in the Boston, Mass., Post-office. To take effect September 17, 1893.

"Very respectfully, JAMES E. WHITE,
General Superintendent."

It would be a gross outrage for a private employer to turn into the street, with only two days' notice, a man who had served him faithfully for twenty years, even if he had come to the conclusion that the interests of his business would be promoted by a change in the place. The outrage is no less gross when the employer is the Federal Government.

The sessions of the "Parliament of Religions" at Chicago last week have undoubtedly served as a great object-lesson in toleration, and have also brought out, to some extent, the fact that the essential unity of all Christian sects, and of so-called heathen religions as well, is to be found in an ideal of humanity which all praise and all confess they do not realize. More than this we do not see that the Parliament has accomplished or could accomplish. It was thought that valuable statements of different beliefs would be made by the gathered representatives of different faiths and nationalities, but it was evident that this could not be done under the rule that nothing should be said by any speaker to injure the sensibilities of any other. With the polemic element thus perforce left out, there was little else for the various delegates to do than to echo Cardinal Gibbons's remark that, though they differed in faith, they could all stand on the platform of charity and benevolence. The very willingness to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make such a colorless and tolerant statement of irreconcilable theological views might easily be taken as a sign of decaying vitality, as well as of increasing good-nature and regard for the opinions of others. It is impossible to imagine John Knox toning down his views in any presence, least of all in that of theological opponents. To him the Chicago Parliament would have been a splendid opportunity to bear his "testimony," which he could never have forgiven himself for not embracing.

According to latest advices it appears that the costly undertaking of turning Manchester into a seaport is rapidly approaching completion. Five miles of quay are already laid; the ship-canal, thirty-five miles long, connecting the city with the tideway of the Mersey, is expected to be open for traffic early next year. One-third of the distance is already open to shipping This gigantic undertaking was begun in 1887. The cost has amounted to £15,000,000 —some £300,000 was sunk in Parliamentary expenses. The canal is capable of passing through vessels of as large tonnage as the Suez Canal. To carry the four important lines of railway which intersected its course over it, has necessitated the construction of viaducts seventy feet high. Six swing-bridges and a high-level cantilever bear main roads over its waters. Elaborate arrangements have had to be made for its intersection by the Bridgewater Canal. The original plan was to level it through on the high-water line of the Mersey; but that was abandoned, and a series of locks now bring the canal at Manchester up to the level of the city, sixty feet over Liverpool. The locks and bridges are opened and shut by hydraulic power. Vessels by the aid of electric light will be passed through by night as easily as by day. Mr. E. Leader Williams is the engineer of this new wonder of the world. There has been considerable jealousy between Liverpool and Manchester with regard to the canal; but, as in most such cases, it is more likely to promote the advancement of both cities than lead to the decadence of one. In any event, Liverpool may have the satisfaction of knowing that, so much has the cost exceeded the first estimate, that not one penny are the original Manchester shareholders likely to get back out of the enterprise.

The city of Paris with its environs boasts nearly one-twelfth of the total population of France, yet it does not escape the charge, which lies against so many other great cities, of being a huge maw into which the best of the national life is sucked. Only in the slightest degree is it the parent of the energy and distinction which it displays on so great a scale. In the political field, scarcely one of the distingui-hed men of the time is Paris-born. The President of the Republic is not, nor is the President of the Senate or of the Chamber; not one of the ten Cabinet Ministers, neither of the Chief Justices nor of the Attorney-Generals of the higher courts, reckons Paris as his birthplace, nor does the Governor of the Bank of France. Somewhat similar results are obtained by scanning the lists of distinguished scholars, artists, journalists, soldiers. From the provinces have come a disproportionate majority of the men whose success in life makes Paris famous. Such facts are more striking in the case of the French capital, whose preponderance over the rest of the country has been so long established, than they would be in a newer country, where the headlong rush to the cities is a comparatively recent thing.

That M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu was defeated as a candidate for the French Legislature at Lodève in the Department of Hérault, and that too by a Radical Socialist, is not a cause for rejoicing, but there are some encouraging features in the vote. The successful candidate obtained 7,250 votes, but M. Leroy-Beaulieu had 6,302. When it is considered that he stands for orthodoxy in political economy, for free trade, for freedom of contract, for the right to work, and against protection, socialism, labor monopolies, and governmental meddling in general, it must be admitted that he ran surprisingly well. As was said of John Mill when he stood for Westminster upon a full and frank declaration of all his views, the Almighty himself couldn't be elected upon such a platform, and M. Leroy-Beaulieu has come nearer to success than we supposed possible. The political future of France is certainly covered with a dark cloud, but if the principles represented by this distinguished statesman and economist really command the support of nearly half the population, as would be indicated by this vote, there is no need to despair of the Republic.

The expulsion of Italian laborers to the number of 800 or 1,000 from the region of Aigues-Mortes has had consequences which might have been foreseen. There has been no rush of French laborers to take the places left vacant, and the operations in the salt-pits have been brought to a standstill. It seems to be the case in France, as it is in this country, that certain kinds of work must be done by imported laborers or they will not be done at all. There is other work of a preferable character sufficient to occupy all the inhabitants, and even high wages will not tempt them to relinquish their usual occupations. Moreover, it is frequently the case that certain kinds of work are extremely fatal to some races, while others can engage in them with impunity. The cultivation of rice in the Carolina swamps cannot be carried on by white men, but the negroes appear to be unaffected by the malarial poison so deadly to the whites. It has often been said that the Central Pacific Railroad could not have been built but for the aid of the Chinese, and most of our present enterprises requiring large forces of strong manual laborers would be greatly hampered if the Italians were not available. It now appears that the Italians employed in the vineyards in the southern part of the Department of the Gard, which are surrounded with marshes, have fled in terror at the reports of the treatment applied to their fellow-countrymen at Aigues-Mortes, and that no substitutes have been found. The Italians are said to be exempt from the fever which prevails about these marshes, while the French are not. However, the chauvinistic view is that it is better to let the salt-pits be closed and the vineyards be abandoned, provided France be preserved for Frenchmen.

Brazil has been a sore trial during the past four years to those enthusiastic souls who thought that all that was needed to make a country a republic was to call it so. There was great rejoicing in this country in 1889 when a military intriguer bundled the Emperor out of Brazil and set himself up as an autocrat under the name of a President. We had to listen to much effusive talk about the disappearance of the last remnant of tyranny from the sacred soil of America, and the reception of Brazil into the "sisterhood of freedom." But it was not long before the truth appeared, that the Brazilians had simply exchanged a cultured and mild-mannered and progressive Emperor for a rough and lawless soldier; and when he in turn fell before new intriguers, it was with some difficulty that the pæans in praise of Brazilian republicanism were again lifted. Now that the time has come around for a new "President" to be elected by the biggest guns in the harbor of Rio de Janeiro, the illusion has pretty much vanished, and we hear little about the blessings of a military oligarchy masquerading as a republic. It would be hard for any one to point out what Brazil has gained by the fall of Dom Pedro except an enormous increase in public expenditures, a condition of sporadic anarchy, and great harm to the real republican movement. There was such a movement in Brazil, directed by intelligent and law-abiding men, and it doubtless would, in time, have brought about a republic by peaceable means. The Emperor himself freely recognized this, and used to say that when the country was ripe for a republic, he would not stand in the way of it. But in an evil day the agitation was taken up by a set of military adventurers, who have made republican institutions synonymous with force and trickery, and so have put back the real progress of the country in the idea and practice of self-government. The experience has been a calamitous one for Brazil, but it will not be entirely fruitless if it leads men to learn once more the old lesson that liberty and self-government are not to be found in names and forms.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TARIFF HEARINGS.

THOSE who had doubts of the necessity or wisdom of the tariff hearings granted by the Committee on Ways and Means must have given them up by this time. It has been a very useful exhibition, on the whole, which the protected manufacturers have made before the Committee, and one which forms a fitting preliminary to the preparation of a tariff bill such as was ordered by the people last November in the teeth of the manufacturers.

The comic view of the hearings it has been left for the *Tribune* to take. With admirable gravity that waggish journal has kept up the pretence that the interested manufacturers were dispassionate students of economics, who had gone to Washington solely in the interests of truth and for the good of the whole country. Following up their "testimony" from day to day, it has kept its readers holding their sides while it has pictured the astonishment and dismay of the Democratic members of the Committee at the novel and powerful arguments which they were compelled to listen to, so it humorously chose to assume, for the first time in their lives. It was, indeed, delicious to conceive of the Committee as a lot of novices who had never before heard of the doctrine that it is the foreigner who pays tariff taxes, that protection is the great system of thaumaturgy which guards against the evils of low prices by making them still lower, and who were just the men to be bowled over and left speechless by the ratiocination of John Jarrett and W. C. Cronemeyer.

We are not able ourselves to treat the hearings with such levity. Upon us the impression made by them has rather been one of melancholy. To see such fatuity, such political and economic blindness, such undisguised selfishness, persisted in and put on exhibition and urged as a rational basis for the fiscal policy of the nation, is as depressing as it is to see proofs of the vitality of any other form of ignorance and superstition. At the very moment when negotiations are closing for putting the Lake Superior iron-ore mines into the hands of a gigantic Trust, and when the negotiators are boasting that they will be in a position to make a profit of more than one dollar a ton, Mr. Ely, their representative, goes to Washington to inform the Committee that if the duty of seventy-five cents a ton is removed, the mines will all be closed and general ruin ensue. Democritus himself could not see anything in that to laugh at. Nor could he in the bearing and arguments of almost all the men who appeared before the Committee. They came forward, one after another, with their unsupported assertions, with their undigested figures respecting the cost of production and the wages of labor, and with their gratuitous prophecies, and seemed to expect that the Committee and the country would never suspect them of prejudice or self-interest.

It seems inconceivable that intelligent men, even if warped by private interest, could any longer imagine that a tariff bill was to be drawn up in that old-fashioned, simple-minded way. For McKinley it was enough, as he privately assured the friends who wondered at his credulity in 1890, that the manufacturers asked for a duty, to prove that they could not get along without it. But we have had three years of education in human nature since then, and that pastoral simplicity is possible no more for ever. The changed standpoint from which the whole question is now to be discussed was very well brought out in the hearing of September 8. A manufacturer of cotton-bagging and binding-twine was arguing against putting any of his products on the free list and was asked about the Cordage Trust. He admitted that combination to be a bad thing, but thought the difficulty might be met by the Committee's making a loud threat to put bagging on the free list if the Trust did not immediately dissolve. Anyhow, he said, he was as much entitled to protection as were the manufacturers of woollen goods or any other articles. Asked if it was fair to compel the farmer to pay higher rates for his bagging when he had to sell his products in the markets of the world, the manufacturer replied that such a query "opened up the whole question of protection," and that he must decline to discuss.

This "testimony" very happily put side by side the old way of looking at the tariff and the new. If a tariff bill is to be a general setting forth of food in a trough, there is, indeed, no reason why one pig should be favored above another, and it is impossible to say that a porker in the shape of a Trust must be shoved aside just because he has not limited himself to his snout and forefeet, but has insisted upon getting into the trough bodily. But if the wisdom of the whole process is once admitted to be doubtful, if "the whole question of protection," which Mr. Stevens, the bagging manufacturer, fought so shy of, is really to be discussed in connection with tariff taxes, then the affair is wholly different. In such case the determining factors are the good of the people as a whole, the needs of the Treasury, and the encouragement of commerce in its broadest sense. A tariff bill based on such factors is precisely what the Committee on Ways and Means has to prepare, and we repeat that the hearings which they have given the men whose only idea of a tariff is of a law for their special benefit, have had their value as exemplifying the way the thing used to be done, in contrast with the way in which the country has now decided that the thing shall be done.

A FORETASTE OF SOCIALISM.

WHATEVER differences may exist among persons of socialistic leanings, there is one fundamental assumption which they agree in making. They must hold that our legislators and administrative officers are somehow endowed with a kind of collective or corporate wisdom by virtue of which they can determine what individual men should do with better results than if the determination were left to the individual men themselves. Government, or the forcible control of men by their fellows, is not, upon this theory, intrinsically undesirable and to be defended only because we are not yet sufficiently developed to regard one another's rights without compulsion. It is rather something good in itself and to be extended, to the diminution of individual freedom and to the increase of the dominion of the majority. It is difficult to see how this theory can find support in the experience of the past; monetary history at least is certainly not in favor of it. From the earliest times men agreed to measure the values of the goods and services which they exchanged in the precious metals, which they weighed out in small pieces for that purpose. Partly for convenience, partly from greed, governments came to undertake the business of stamping the weight upon these pieces, and very soon proceeded to defraud their subjects in the operation. They falsified both weight and quality, and there is scarcely a government in operation that has not at some time engaged in this sort of stealing.

In the course of time the dealings of merchants upon credit developed bills of exchange and promissory notes into money, and their governments proceeded to borrow the idea with even more fraudulent results. They had stamped false representations upon coins which yet had some intrinsic value, but now they were able to put the same stamp upon pieces of paper that had no intrinsic value at all. The history of the inflation and repudiation that governments were able to practise through this device is a long and dismal one, and the chapter is far from being closed. Many governments are insolvent now, and it is highly probable that several more will be added to the number before this generation has passed away, perhaps even before this century is ended. So far from regulating the contracts of their subjects with greater wisdom than the subjects could manifest, governments have not only meddled disastrously with those contracts, but have shamefully and notoriously dishonored their own.

We do not see how any one can find any better support for the assumptions of socialism in our present financial experience than in the financial history of the past. Had they been left to themselves, the people who are engaged in business would have had no trouble about a standard of value. They would have based their contracts upon definite weights of gold or silver as they preferred, and would have accepted paper in place of metal only in so far as it commended itself

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the judgment of each individual as a satisfactory equivalent. But the assumed superior wisdom of the Government did not let them do this. It compell d them by force first to accept paper as equal to coin, and then to accept a certain weight of silver as equal to a certain weight of gold. This was embarrassing enough, but for a time the natural loyalty of the people gave effect to these arbitrary decrees, and the dollars of paper, of silver, and of gold were practically equivalent. But this did not satisfy the Government, and it enacted a law which presently satisfied the people that this artificial parity could not be maintained, and that the intrinsic value of the silver dollar must become the standard of all exchanges. So soon as this opinion came to prevail we know what happened; and the people are now imploring their Government to terminate this exhibition of its superior wisdom, and allow them a portion of that freedom of contract which both natural rights and constitutional law pronounce theirs. They have succeeded in bringing a portion of their rulers to yield to their arguments and entreaties; but the S nate so far refuses to be moved, and stands squarely upon the socialistic assumption that it knows what is good for the people better than they know themselves.

If the assumption of the superior wisdom of rulers finds little support in their financial practice, it finds less in their theories. Whoever will be at the pains to read the speeches now in course of delivery in the Senate will be amazed at the pure folly of most of them. They are not only disfigured by ignorance of history and disregard of logic which would disgrace an intelligent schoolboy, but they are filled with talk which would be thought to indicate want of mental balance in Bedlam. Their authors babble of colossal crimes and universal conspiracies, and seem wild with nightmare terrors at the thought of allowing people, the most enterprising as well as the most conservative, to make contracts on a gold basis even if they are unanimous in desiring it. Their credulity, if they are sincere, about the plots and purposes of the bankers and capitalists of the world would make Cotton Mather blush for his scepticism, and their visions of the woes that will follow the repeal of the Sherman Act are scarcely less dreadful than those of the Apocalypse. Meanwhile, the gentle Socialist, with this spectacle before him, talks glibly of the necessity of committing our railroads to the care of the Government.

It is idle to think of getting the control of the standard of value away from the Government. It is there, and there it will stay. But it is absurd to maintain that Government has displayed superior wisdom either in regulating our money or in talking about its regulation. It is impossible to deny that if the matter had been left to be settled by the free agreement of men they would long before this have worked out a sound system of currency, just as they have worked out sound systems in other departments of business. They would not have got themselves into such a scrape as they are now in, and if they had they would have got themselves out of it a great deal quicker than Congress can do it. Be this as it may, it seems strange for any one to deny that it is a terrible thing to have the very basis of all credit at the mercy of such men as are now delivering speeches in the Senate of the United States. Doubtless many people are drawn towards socialism as an ideal, thinking perhaps more of regulating the affairs of others than of having their affairs regulated by others; but if they look at the practical working of the theory as illustrated today in our own Government, they may experience some revulsion of feeling.

LORDS VS. COMMONS.

THE division in the House of Lords on Sept mber 8 closed for the present the Home-Rule episode in British politics. The majority against the bill was, of course, very large, but one of the most curious features of the crisis was the eagerness of the Gladstonians to have the adverse majority as large as possible, so as to make the Peers, as a body, a more conspicuous mark for Radical indignation. There could, in fact, hardly be a better justification of the attacks made on them than has been afforded by the debate and division on the Home-Rule Bill. Six months' work of the Commons has been nullified in two nights by men for whose opinions nobody in England cares "tuppence," and who make no pretence of understanding the question.

Some anti-Gladstonians who do not attempt to defend the competence of the Lords to pass final judgment on a measure like the Home-Rule Bill, say that in throwing it out the Lords are performing their real function under the Constitution —that is, the function of making delay and compelling the Ministry to submit the measure to the country by a dissolution. Even if they admit that the principle of home rule was approved of by the constituencies last year — which they try to avoid — they maintain that the public knew nothing of the details of the bill, which in a measure of this sort are all-important, and the Lords, therefore, in compelling the Ministers to submit the bill itself as passed by the Commons for popular approval, are doing their appointed duty. This has a very plausible sound, but its untenableness from a constitutional point of view was very fully exposed by Lord Playfair. This view of the function of the Lords assumes that the Swiss referendum has a place in the British Constitution, and that Parliament is a body not of legislators, but of delegates with a "mandate" to draft bills and submit them to the popular judgment. It would be difficult to fish out of the various amendments proposed for the British Constitution by reformers during the past hundred years, one more opposed than this is to the theory of the powers of Parliament, and of the relations of Parliament to the voters, hitherto held by all English politicians since 1688. Nothing more democratic and more democratizing, as Lord Playfair pointed out, has ever emanated even from the Tories in the days of their greatest distress. Suffice it to say that in England Parliament has for two hundred years been "omnipotent"; that no bill has ever been submitted to the people for approval after passage by the House of Commons; that it is the principle of a measure which, under the British Constitution, the voters are called on to adopt or reject, and that the embodiment of the principle in legislation has always been left to the majority in both houses.

The idea that the House of Lords has any power to compel the Ministry of the day to dissolve and go to the country, or has, in fact, anything whatever to say about dissolution, is equally novel. The one function which usage has left to the Lords since the passage of the Reform Bill is the function of imposing further consideration in the Commons by refusing to pass a bill sent up to them. The notion that besides the imposing this further consideration they could insist on the Ministers submitting a bill to the constituencies by a general election was never heard of till now, and, if adopted, would introduce one of the most startling and far reaching changes ever made in the machinery of the British Government; for, of course, nobody of ordinary intelligence can doubt that the submission of the Home-Rule Bill to the popular vote would become a precedent, and that a similar demand would be made in the case of all important measures. Thus the "mother of parliaments" would be speedily converted into a mere drafter of propositions for plébiscites, and the destruction of representative institutions which this would involve would be very rapid.

Apropos of this, Lord Rosebery, in his shrewd and amusing remarks, drew attention to the large part the Lords play in democratizing English institutions, while persuading the country squires and the old ladies that they are the great bulwarks against the assaults of democracy, and he instanced their passage of the extension of the suffrage in 1867 and of the County Councils Bill two years ago—measures to which, as levellers, the Irish Home-Rule Bill cannot even approach. No Irish Parliament could hold a candle to the London County Council alone as an engine for the upheaval of the ancient Constitution of the realm in Church and State. It is not as yet quite in working order, but when it is, it must, as the concentration of the hopes and fears, greed and illusions, of 5,000,000 of the most powerful bit of the English democracy, speedily make Mr. Gladstone himself seem "a stern and unbending Tory."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Herschel met the constitutional objections to the passage of the bill with unanswerable force. There was nothing finer in Chatham than his turning on the Opposition, when they cheered his statement that the majority in Ireland was "disloyal" "Ah, you cheer that," he said in substance, "you are pleased with it, proud of it—pleased that, after ninety years of your rule, the majority of a community at your own doors detest it, and would fain be rid of it." It was a happy catch, of which he made brilliant use. Lord Rosebery was equally fortunate in his retort to Lord Muskerry, one of that deplorable class, the Irish "representative Peers," who go about the world abusing and deriding the majority of their countrymen, and yet, though discussing Irish affairs as Irishmen, have little more connection with the Irish people than with the Bretons, and just as little authority to speak in their behalf. "Lord Muskerry," said Lord Rosebery, "says he knows all about Ireland, but what does Ireland know about Lord Muskerry?" These two remarks, few words as they contain, go almost to the heart of the Irish question.

THE COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION—VIII.

BOTANY—MINERALOGY—GEOLOGY.

CHICAGO, September, 1893.

THE Forestry Building at Jackson Park contains much that appeals to the scientific botanist as well as to the economist or commercial man. In the matter of woods it is probable that a wholly unrivalled collection of woods of the world might be gathered from the exhibits in the various State and national buildings, together with those in the division of Forestry. Apart from their botanic and economic interest, these specimens appeal strongly to the æsthetic sense. No natural product can exceed in intrinsic beauty some of the fine slabs cut from burls of redwood, maple, walnut, and the like, which are to be seen in the Forestry and California Buildings especially, as well as in numerous other places. Many of the sections of large trees retain a notable proportion of the dignity which characterized them on their native mountain side, and no more impressive central object could have been chosen for the Government Building than the massive Sequoian pillar which is erected there. The exhibit of living plants in the greenhouses and Horticultural Building seems somewhat disappointing, though containing much that is good. There is a grievous lack of good labels; and if there are rare and interesting plants not common to the average large greenhouse, no means have been taken to direct public attention to them. Like every assemblage of ornamental plants, the collection is attractive, but, so far as I have observed, in no way particularly distinguished.

The chief deficiency felt by every visitor to the Fair who has special interests is the lack of any general subject-catalogue or directory. The presence of so many State and national buildings, most of which contain a more or less synoptic exhibit, has resulted in the scattering of small local collections in all parts of the grounds, so that the botanist, for instance, must visit thirty buildings before he can assure himself that nothing of importance in his specialty remains unseen, and even then unexpected discoveries are constantly being made. A few countries or States have adopted the plan of posting, with each division of their exhibits, an announcement as to where all the other divisions are located. If this plan had been generally followed, and a small handbook with a subject-index prepared from the posters, for visitors, much good would have been done and many disappointments avoided.

Systematic botany is poorly represented outside of the Government bureaus and experiment stations. In the Woman's Building a few dried plants are shown, and small herbaria compose part of several State exhibits. A few fossil plants may be found in the collection shown by the United States Geological Survey, and I noticed some, unlabelled, in the miscellaneous collection contained in the Costa Rica Building. To descend to the more humble forms, of which so much has been said of late, edible and poisonous fungi are exhibited by the Division of Microscopy, Agricultural Department, and a large series of cultures of bacteria by the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Marine Hospital Service. These are well displayed and attract much attention. The illustrations of the vertical or zonal distribution of plant and animal life made by the Division of Ornithology and Mammalology, Agricultural Department, are instructive and interesting, and the same may be said of the exhibit of the Division of Vegetable Pathology, in which the fungoid diseases of plants, their nature, area of distribution, and remedy, are fully exemplified.

In the present Exposition for the first time the mining industries have been recognized as a group of the first importance by the devotion to their uses of one of the principal buildings. This recognition is sufficiently just, not only because the group is a natural one, but on account of the great prominence it attains in the United States, the first mining country in the world. That it has been duly appreciated is obvious from the excellent manner in which the exhibits have been classified and labelled, and the ingenious devices which have been adopted by many of the exhibitors to illustrate their respective industries.

Many of the State buildings contain collections illustrating their mineral resources and geology, but the most satisfactory display is made by those who exhibit in the Mining Building. A few notes on the more striking features of these localized collections may be of use to the visitor. Arizona displays a remarkable series of azurites and other copper ores, and fine sections of agatized wood. Her material is well labelled and neatly arranged. In the Colorado collection specimens of crystallized gold are particularly noteworthy. The Mexican exhibit is poorly labelled. It contains attractive specimens of rose garnet from Xalostoc, beautiful in color and unusual in size. Montana has a fine display of ores and the notorious silver statue, which has more artistic merit than one would have expected from a production represented as making a pile of buzzard dollars equal in weight to the same number of gold double-eagles. In the collection from Utah the display of Gilsonite asphalt is worth attention. Among the riches of California are displayed semi-transparent sheets of the so-called "onyx" marble, of exquisite beauty, a delicate gray infiltration resulting in the most tender landscape effects, like the melting mists of Japanese artists. They come from San Luis Obispo County, and are not equalled by any of the other exhibits of this material which I have examined. South Dakota shows some beautiful agatized wood, phosphate of uranium in particularly pretty crystals, and fine calcite crystals from the Black Hills. Some handsome red freestone and quartzites appear among the building stones. The Harney Peak tin mines are in evidence by large masses of ore, though for some occult reason the owners of these mines go on spending fabulous sums upon them without producing anything very remarkable in the way of tin.

Missouri has a noteworthy collection of zinc ores, as well as the metallic product, illustrated by an excellent relief map of the State. The State Geological Survey coöperates with an excellent synoptic collection well arranged and labelled. From Michigan, as one would expect, comes a grand series of iron and copper minerals. Specimens of a green serpentine from Ishpeming are handsome, but the rock seems too faulty to prove of commercial importance in decorative work. The exhibit of British Columbia is noticeable for its excellent system and clear labelling. Brazil, on the other hand, offers the most complete illustration imaginable of how not to do it. She has a large, well-situated space, plenty of case room, and an extensive and, apparently, well selected and neatly trimmed series of minerals. These must have cost great labor and much time to prepare. They are put in trays with badly written Portuguese labels, *the labels under the specimens*, where they cannot possibly be read even by those who might understand them. The cases are dusty and forlorn; the time and expense devoted to this exhibit have been almost absolutely wasted for want of a little common sense.

Canada offers an excellent, well-displayed collection, in which the apatite minerals, micas and asbestos are especially fine and the gold noteworthy. New South Wales has an admirably systematic exhibit of her mineral resources, presented in the best manner. Ohio has a neat and well-arranged display, and the New York exhibit by the State Museum is very creditable in contents, arrangement, and labelling. Kentucky has a good exhibit with a creditable relief-map of the State. West Virginia has a really grand display of coal, coke, and mineral oils, well labelled. The exhibit of Pennsylvania is admirable and illustrated by many excellent relief-maps.

The use of the relief-map is becoming very general as a self-explanatory guide to the character of the country represented, and one notes with pleasure the gradual abandonment of the exaggerated vertical scale which gave rise to so many false ideas. The most satisfactory maps of the Exposition are those in which the vertical scale is to the horizontal as not more than three or four to one, and the few old-style maps which appear among the many give, in comparison, the impression of caricatures. Other means of illustrating the geology of mining operations and the ramifications of mines are shown by various devices. In one form the excavations are represented by solid bars of wood of small size built up upon one another like a puzzle, and supported by strips of a different color. The most ingenious method observed consists in recording in color, on separate thin sheets of glass, the position of the excavations in the section the particular sheet refers to; and also indicating on each the surface contour of the ground. These sheets are placed side by side in a frame, and the view obtained by looking through them impresses one as the most satisfactory way of grasping the scheme of subterranean works which has yet been invented. In the Michigan exhibit the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Mining Company

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gives an instructive geological section of one of its mines, in which the native materials proper to the separate strata are used, and the timbering of the excavations is shown in miniature. A very suggestive exhibit is a monument, about thirty feet high, composed of different mineral substances in cubes, the larger below, with a gradual diminution upward, designed to portray the average amount of each particular mineral mined in each second of time during the year in the United States. The size of the cubes depends upon calculations made from records of the mineral product collected by the United States Geological Survey, and presumably refers to the latest figures.

Considering the Exposition as a whole, the most prominent feature in which it differs from that of 1876, in this department, apart from mass of material and style of presentation, is in the superior utilization of decorative minerals. The agatized woods of the West are now sliced into thin sections of varied color and sometimes of remarkable beauty, to be utilized in ways which twenty years ago would have been quite impracticable. The travertine marble, or "Mexican onyx," has become an important decorative material; and as no two pieces are alike, it offers a constant and agreeable variety. A very pretty form of this mineral, cloudy-white with rosy veins, is shown in the gallery from newly opened mines in Lower California. The variety from California has been already mentioned, and the best-known form, from Mexico, combines the most delicate cloudy greens and browns with translucent white. The excessively hard quartzite or jasper rock, of varied reds and browns, is now cut into polished columns suited to the most luxurious interior decoration. The increase in the facilities for working hard materials may be noted in every cemetery, where granite is rapidly supplanting the softer marbles and sandstones formerly almost universal.

In the department of Geology, properly speaking, the Fair is not especially rich. Several of the State surveys make creditable exhibits, among which New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Missouri are noteworthy. In the Government Building the United States Geological Survey shows a representative series of rocks and fossils of the United States, a restoration of the skeleton of *Dinoceras*, and an important series of relief-maps, illustrations, photographs, and transparencies of geological scenery. A collection from the mines of Alaska, which is unfortunately obscured by its position in the gallery where very few visitors go, would probably repay more study than it is likely to receive. In the department of crystalline minerals and gems, the National Museum makes a small but typical display, with the addition of series illustrative of vulcanology, glacial phenomena, and the features associated with the limestone caverns which are so extensively distributed in the United States.

One of the most interesting exhibits to the average visitor is that of the De Beers Diamond Mining Company of South Africa. A large quantity of the diamantiferous rock has been brought to the Exposition, and daily a portion of it is crushed, washed, and worked over, while in the same division of the building a number of Tiffany's diamond-cutters are at work on the rough gems, of which a fine series is shown. In this connection it may be mentioned that the Tiffany exhibit in the Liberal Arts Building contains a number of fine specimens of precious and semi-precious stones, in various conditions, including both the rough and the fully cut gems. These are well worth examination. With them is Col. Hamlin's celebrated necklace of cut tourmalines, lent for the occasion, and to our mind a far more beautiful and desirable object than the large yellow diamond which may be seen close by, and which has become the property of a Chicago magnate, at the cost of a small fortune. The Hamlin tourmalines are nearly all derived from New England, near the town of Paris, Maine, and embrace nearly every tint which that beautiful and variable gem assumes. The carefully cut and beautifully set stones which compose the necklace are the gleanings of thirty years or so, and, both as gems and as American gems, they form an entirely unique collection.

Lovers of the unusual may be interested to know that in the building devoted to the State of Washington is the largest single block of coal ever mined, if the claims of its owners be correct. It is to be regretted that its quality is not as exceptional as its size, as it belongs to the group of semilignitic bituminous coals so widely distributed west of the Rocky Mountains.

W. H. D.

THE HOME-RULE BILL.

LONDON, September 2, 1893.

THE Government of Ireland Bill was introduced by Mr. Gladstone into the House of Commons on the 13th of February amid wintry frosts and fogs. It was with us through a lovely spring, as the trees burst forth into leaf and the rhododendrons gladdened our eyes in the parks. It was with us throughout an all too glorious summer; and now the curtain falls on the last act of the drama while autumn is in the air and skies, and dead leaves are thick under foot in Kensington Gardens. The third reading was passed this morning by a majority of 34, and the bill was at once committed to the House of Lords, where it will be rejected next week by an overwhelming majority.

To dwell here on the details of the measure would be needless and inappropriate. It is an honest effort to separate, as to government in Ireland, what is exclusively Irish from what appertains to the Empire—relegating the former to legislative assemblies in Ireland, chosen by the Irish people, retaining the latter under the immediate control of the Imperial Parliament. Regarding both internal and external affairs there are many restrictions which are to a certain extent galling, evincing as they do a want of confidence in the Irish people. These have, however, been frankly accepted by the Irish members, nor would the Irish people desire to transgress the assigned limits. Their action will, it is believed, belie the necessity for such restrictions, which, indeed, must be regarded more as a politic concession to Conservative prejudice and opposition than as an indication of mistrust on the part of Mr. Gladstone and his followers. Theoretically this new charter is sadly circumscribed compared with that of Grattan's Parliament of 1782–1800. But practically it would be far freer. The ambiguities of the relations between Great Britain and Ireland under that constitution would be now impossible. The world is smaller and compacter than it was one hundred years ago, political life is more definite, while thought has widened. The *Esto perpetua* of 1782 sank in the suspicions, bloodshed, venality, and intrigues of eighteen years later. The consummation of the establishment of a constitution such as has now been offered us by the House of Commons, might not be hailed in the dramatic spirit prevalent before the Terror had sobered Liberalism; but there is every reason to anticipate that that constitution would be what is termed enduring. By 72 of the 103 Irish members it has been formally accepted as a closing of the strife of 700 years. From nine others, the Redmondite wing, the assent has been less complete.

Regarding general principles and structure the bill comes out unimpaired. A few immaterial amendments proposed by the Opposition were accepted. By the Government itself extensive alterations were made on three points. The rights of the present civil service in Ireland, upon being relegated to an Irish Government, to continuance in office or to sufficient pension, were more clearly defined, established, and provided for. The "in and out"* clause was abandoned with the substitution of the continued presence of eighty Irish members in the Imperial Parliament for all purposes. Thirdly, the financial arrangements were altered. As the bill originally stood, the internal Irish taxes (in round numbers £4,500,000) were left to be collected by Ireland for her benefit, while the impost or customs taxes (some £2,250,000) were to be handed over to the Imperial Government as Ireland's contribution to Imperial charges. Under this scheme, it was estimated that Ireland would have a surplus of £500,000 over her present income. But a mistake in the calculations of the Government officials was detected: Ireland's internal revenue had been overestimated by £350,000, which would by so much diminish her anticipated surplus of £500,000. It was also seen that there would be considerable complications of accounts between the Imperial and Irish treasuries, and perhaps the determined threats in Ulster of refusing to pay taxes to an Irish exchequer had something to do with the arrangement ultimately embodied in the bill. This was that the Imperial Government should collect all general taxes relating to Ireland, calculated at £6,786,000; that it should retain one-third of this amount (£2,267,000) as Ireland's share of Imperial charges, and return the balance (£4,524,000) to Ireland, as her revenue. These calculations are based upon the revenue returns of the past four years, which show that the gross revenue of the United Kingdom has been £95,000,000, and the net for Imperial purposes £63,000,000. It will be observed how exceedingly small is Ireland's present estimated capacity to bear taxation in proportion to Great Britain's. In the matter of income tax on trades and professions, Great Britain is assessed on a return of £300,000,000, Ireland on but £9,000.000. For death-rates Great Britain is assessed on £207,000,000, Ireland on £12,000,000.

There was no fiercer contention than over these money clauses. The Government maintained they were fair. Mr. Chamberlain and his followers declared the taxpayers of Great Britain were about to be fleeced for Ireland's as well as their own destruction to the extent of fully £500,000 per annum. The Irish stated that, while prepared to buy home rule at almost any price, they considered £2,250,000 per annum as an Imperial contribution quite beyond the bounds of reason—indeed, they questioned whether, considering the past relations of the countries, a substantial annual subsidy was not due to them. They were in the end appeased by the promise of a committee to inquire into the financial relations of the coun-

*The original arrangement under which the Irish members should be retained in Parliament for Imperial, while precluded from interfering in British, affairs, has been styled the "in and out" proposal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries, with, moreover, after a stated period, if found necessary, a modification of the terms now proposed.

The bill has taken 82 days to pass—nearly twice as long as any previous measure, and that before the introduction of closure. The passing of the Constitution of 1782 for Ireland occupied 2 days; that of the Union, 13 days; the Reform Bill of 1832, 47 days; the Land Bill of 1881, 46 days. This Government of Ireland Bill occupied as much time as collectively the passage of the Union, the great Reform Bill, the repeal of the Corn Laws, the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and the establishment of the Dominion of Canada. There were 182 divisions, the time spent in which amounted to eight working days of eight hours each without meal hours, and in which members walked some ten miles. The more days elapsed, the bulkier grew the amendment papers. The discussion, proceeding unchecked at the same rate, would have terminated probably in time for the Christmas holidays of 1894. In Committee on the Bill there were 459 speeches favoring the measure, occupying 57 hours, and 936 speeches against it, occupying 153 hours. Upon clauses 3 and 4 alone there were put down 326 amendments.

The avowed object of the Opposition was not fairly to discuss, but, in the words of one of their own spokesmen, "to make the bill detestable." On the 10th of July the Opposition voted for the retention of 103 Irish members for Imperial purposes only. The same evening, in another division, it voted for their total exclusion. Next day the same party voted that forty should be retained for all purposes—on another division forty-eight; two days later, for the retention of the "in and out" clause and eighty members, and again for 103 Irish representatives. As was well said this morning by Mr. Morley, if, according to their convictions, it was the patriotic duty of the Opposition to obstruct, it was, according to our convictions, the patriotic duty of the Government to closure.

"In order," says the *Times*, "that our readers may better appreciate the effect of Mr. Gladstone's 'gagging' policy, we print below the text of the Government of Ireland Bill as amended in Committee, in such a fashion as to show at a glance how large a portion of the measure has been forced through without the shadow of debate. The only clauses or parts of clauses which the House of Commons has had an opportunity of discussing are those printed in italics."

The contrast presented by the seven columns which follow is, to the uninitiated, striking enough, the italics forming but a small proportion of the whole. But we must consider the relative importance of the several clauses, and the days subsequently spent on the report stage. Many minor details were unquestionably passed without debate, but the following, comprising the main principles involved, were amply discussed: the establishment of an Irish legislature; its powers, exemptions from powers, and disabilities; the Irish Executive; representation in Imperial Parliament; financial relations; status and future of judges and civil servants; the police. This is, however, only one of the many questions connected with the passage of the bill which can be much better understood by those who have heard the debates than by the outside public. It is especially one of those upon which it will be easier to prejudice than to assure the electors of the United Kingdom.

So much for the manner in which the bill has been carried. The consideration of its prospects I propose postponing to another letter. Yet, before concluding, I feel impelled to quote two passages from this final debate which appear to me to go to the root of the whole controversy. One from Mr. Gladstone's speech:

"Are we, then, bound to admit that, after the seven hundred years of the British connection with Ireland, after England, during the whole of that time, has occupied a dominant, and Ireland a subsidiary position—that, after all that, with all the responsibilities of superiority upon us, the result of our treatment of Ireland is this—that we have brought her to a state in which she cannot undertake without danger and ruin the very responsibilities which, in every other country, have been found to be within the capacity of the people and to be fraught with the richest benefits to them?"

The other from Mr. Morley. Speaking of Mr. Balfour, on the opposite side of the table, and of himself, he said that both had, he believed, endeavored to regard the situation in Ireland with a "clear and steady gaze." In their diagnosis of Irish maladies there was considerable agreement. It was only when they came to remedies that they differed:

"Our disagreement can be stated in a sentence. The right honorable gentleman is for a persistence in the conditions which have produced that state of things now baffling and confounding us. I, and those with whom I have the honor to act, are in favor of a resort to those conditions, those maxims, and those principles of government which the English-speaking race have tried all over the globe, and have never tried without finding in them healing and virtue."

Mr. Morley is, of all the actors in this great drama, the one that has inspired me with feelings of the profoundest respect and admiration. He would not be human if, occupying the position he does, and burdened with its responsibilities, he had not been, as I believe he has been, to an appreciable degree "captured" by the permanent officials in Dublin Castle. But his grasp and power of exposition of great principles, his balanced fairness, his administrative ability, are beyond all praise. I can think of no instance in our time of a man who had won such a position in the serene atmosphere of literature and philosophic thought, stepping down, from overflowing desire to serve his kind, into the arena, too often alternately dusty and muddy, of politics. Men say he can never be regarded as a politician in the "highest" sense of the term. So much the worse for politics. It is said that the march of democracy will tend more and more to eliminate such men from public life. So much the worse for democracy. D. B.

THE MEMOIRS OF GEN. BIGARRÉ.—II.

PARIS, August 30, 1893.

WE left Gen. Bigarré when, in a fit of anger with Napoleon, after Austerlitz, he asked permission to enter the service of King Joseph Bonaparte. I had first resolved to abandon him and not to follow him to Naples and Spain; but, on reading over this second part of the Memoirs, it seemed to me interesting to study the work of Napoleon and the French Revolution outside of France, and to note what were the sentiments of the peoples which had been disturbed by the French armies. I had always heard from the men whom I had known as survivors of Napoleon's time, that the French became, on the whole, popular wherever they went; but I took such declarations with many grains of allowance. The testimony of Bigarré, attached to one of Napoleon's brothers, has some value in this question of French influence outside of France, especially as he writes without any partisan spirit, and does not give himself out as the representative of the ideas of the Revolution.

Let us follow him first to Naples. He crossed the Alps, and arrived in Milan on the 10th of November, 1806. Prince Eugène Beauharnais was Viceroy, and Milan was his capital. "The Royal Guard of Italy was at least as fine as the guard of the Emperor Napoleon. The luxury of the court and of the city enriched commerce and agriculture. The Lombards regret now [this was written after the Restoration] sincerely the good time of the splendid reign of a viceroy who was always a good ruler to them." This is confirmed by all the notes, letters, and writings of Henri Beyle. Bigarré saw Joseph at Milan, who gave him a letter to carry to Pope Pio VII. At Naples he found the high nobility quite loyal to King Joseph. "This nobility, which owned all the territory of the kingdom, showed itself very devoted to the new sovereign, and inspired him with the greatest confidence; he admitted it to the head of his Cabinet, of his council, of his armies, and to all the offices of his household." By Napoleon's order, all the aides-de-camp of Joseph were French; but he had only two Frenchmen in his household. Bigarré was appointed colonel and aide-de-camp to the King; he commanded the first Neapolitan regiment of the line. His regiment was quartered at Capua; the officers belonged to the poorest families of the nobility. "It was not rare to see in a Neapolitan regiment of two battalions more than thirty married officers, who were followed from garrison to garrison by their wives and children. This life absorbed their meagre salary, and the chiefs had no scruple in robbing their companies so as to find the means to satisfy their own needs." Bigarré, who had strict notions on finance, found it very difficult to extirpate these habits.

He had to make a few expeditions against the brigands, and to take his part in a popular movement in Naples. A Marquis Palmieri had attempted to assassinate the King, and on the day of his execution a Capuchin told the people from the scaffold that Palmieri was a martyr, and promised indulgences to those who should follow his example. At the same moment, some soldiers who were around the scaffold were stabbed with poniards. Palmieri, who already had the rope round his neck, contrived to escape. He was, however, seized again, but the Capuchin was never found. Forty-two lazzaroni, taken with poniards in their hands, were summarily executed. King Joseph "wished to reign over the Neapolitans only by justice. It cost him much to be forced to employ rigorous means, but English malevolence and the perfidy of Queen Caroline were so active and sanguinary that several times he was obliged to stop the effusion of blood by sacrificing a few brigands armed for assassination." Bigarré speaks in glowing terms of the character and the intellect of Joseph; he confesses "that he had all the *galanterie* of Henri IV.; but it is not true that he ever lost in the society of the *beau sexe* a single hour claimed by the Council of State or the Cabinet."

When Joseph was made King of Spain, he ordered Bigarré to join him at Madrid, and to take, on his way, Napoleon's orders at Bayonne. The capitulation of Gen. Dupont at Baylen had forced Napoleon to take the field himself in Spain. The Emperor left Bayonne for Toulouse, where Bigarré witnessed a reception which Napoleon gave to a deputation of monks. "Irate with these monks, who passed for the instigators in Spain of the insurrection against the French, he said to them

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very dryly and with an air of ill humor: '*Messieurs les moines*, if you dare to meddle with our military affairs, I promise you that I will have your ears cut off.'" Joseph Bonaparte was denounced by the priests, all over Spain, "as a sovereign without any religious principles and of bad conduct. He was represented in many caricatures with a red face, a fat body, having a bottle in each hand and a crucifix under his feet." It was Bigarré's belief that "Joseph suited very well the great masses of the cultured Spanish proprietors, but the priests saw in him a second edition of his brother Napoleon, and dreaded the system of government adopted in France."

Napoleon conducted the campaign with his usual rapidity. From Astorga, he ordered Marshal Soult to pursue the English army, under Sir John Moore, and to prevent, if possible, its embarking at Corunna. Bigarré was sent to Marshal Soult by King Joseph, and made the journey from Madrid to Astorga, with two soldiers only and his valet, at a time when all Spain was in insurrection. "I met everywhere burned villages, bodies of dead men and horses, broken carriages; not a man was seen in the villages. The English retreat was so rapid that all the luggage was abandoned on the road to Corunna. I am sure I saw at least four thousand of their horses with bobtails, which they had hamstrung." Bigarré heard at Santiago the details of the affair of Corunna and of the death of the English general. Who does not know the fine poem:

> "Not a drum was heard, not a funeral note,
> As his corse to the rampart we hurried"?

Bigarré, who was in constant danger from guerillas on his way to Soult, says that he would rather have fought a battle every day than to ride as he did from Madrid to Santiago. As a volunteer on the staff of the vanguard and of Marshal Soult, he participated in the campaign in Portugal. Soult attacked the formidable line which defended Oporto, the second town of Portugal, situated on the Douro. The storming of Oporto was a terrible affair; the bridge over the Douro was the scene of a horrible carnage. Marshal Soult succeeded, by a few acts of great severity, in saving the town from pillage. He remained in Oporto forty-two days, entered into communication with the Bishop of Braga and some Portuguese of distinction, and made them understand that Napoleon did not wish to annex Portugal to Spain; Portugal was to remain independent.

"He advised them to exercise some pressure on the Emperor, so as to obtain from him the authorization to throw off the yoke of the family of Braganza; and as the Bishop of Braga, very influential in the country, saw nothing to hinder Marshal Soult from himself becoming the sovereign of this rich country, he invited Gen. Ricard to throw money to the people of Oporto, and to incite it to cry, 'Viva el Rey Nicolas.'" Soult's projects did not, however, please some of his subordinates; two colonels were even accused of being in communication with the English General, Arthur Wellesley.

One day Soult sent for Bigarré and said to him:

"I am in the most embarrassing position. I have before me twenty thousand Englishmen who are in want of nothing. A Portuguese corps of as many men is on its way to cross the Douro. Gen. Silveira, with twenty-five thousand men, is behind me; the whole Portuguese population waits only for a signal to join all these armies. I am without communication with Spain, and, if I credit the rumors in circulation, the French Army has been obliged to evacuate the Peninsula. In this state of things, not being able to remain at Oporto, I have determined to retreat to Spain."

The retreat was difficult. Soult fortunately met Marshal Ney at Luzo. At Madrid, Bigarré saw Joseph Bonaparte, who everybody believed had been killed, and resumed his duties of aide-de-camp. Marshal Victor, by his victory of Medellin, had given a new lease of power to Joseph, whom Bigarré found holding a magnificent court. He accompanied him to Andalusia, and says that "the noble Andalusians exhausted their invention to manifest their love and devotion to the new King of Spain; some sent him a dozen magnificent horses, others placed at the disposal of his Majesty their wives, their daughters, and their homes." We are obliged to think that Bigarré had but a poor knowledge of the Spanish language, and did not understand the true meaning of the expression, so commonly used, "á la disposición de Usted." He adds: "The people, quite as effusive as the clergy and the noblemen, was beside itself for joy when it gazed upon the King every moment of the day. *Il se vautrait devant lui* as soon as it saw him on horseback in the streets, or at the balcony of the palace of the Alcazar." Nevertheless, Bigarré could not help seeing a vague disquietude on the faces of the priests and the monks. They sang the "Te deum," but said with a low voice, "Paciencia."

Joseph visited Cadiz, Malaga, Granada, and, in this military promenade, he encountered everywhere the same enthusiasm. Meanwhile the guerilla war continued in all the provinces of the north. "The guerillas did more harm to the French troops than the regular armies throughout the Spanish war; it is certain that they assassinated no less than a hundred men a day. In five years they thus killed 180,000 Frenchmen without having lost more than 25,000 men, for these undisciplined bands never fought in the open field unless they were more than five to one." The guerillas attacked chiefly the soldiers who came back from the hospitals and the sick soldiers who lagged behind the columns. Joseph often felt the uncertainty of his position. One evening he had, on his uniform, his hat, his sword, his orders, at least eight millions' worth of diamonds. "You see all this?" said he to Bigarré. "Well, I would willingly abandon it, leave this fine palace and all its treasures, to go and live at Morfontaine as a French prince, with my wife and children, rather than be a King of Spain without independence."

Independence was the dream of Joseph; he meant by it independence of his brother Napoleon. The Emperor was willing to give crowns to his brothers, but he never ceased to treat them as subordinates, as his lieutenants; their armies were to be his armies, their treasury his treasury. The correspondence of Napoleon is extremely instructive on this point. On the whole, Napoleon was right: Joseph, Louis, were nothing without him; they were mere satellites; their power could not survive his power. They were but *figurants* in the great drama in which Napoleon was the supreme actor. Posterity will care less for them than for the marshals who surrounded the Emperor, who fought with him a hundred battles, and were to him what the *preux* were to Charlemagne.

Correspondence.

TALLEYRAND AND RANDOLPH.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: On my return to England to-day, after two months' absence, I read for the first time two interesting paragraphs in the *Nation*, June 29, concerning a MS. of Talleyrand discovered among the Hamilton papers—a diplomatic opinion on the Fauchet despatch No. 10, which "certainly," says one paragraph, "makes short work with the skilfully woven but inadequate defence of Randolph made by Mr. Conway." To pronounce a defence inadequate does not prove it so, and on that score I might be content to await still some argument against my position, as I have waited five years since its publication. As, however, your justice will no doubt allow me space to plead against the summary sentence, I avail myself of the opportunity because the Fauchet-Randolph affair is invested with fresh historical interest by the Talleyrand MS., an interest likely to be increased by other documents (unpublished) discovered since the publication of my Life of Randolph.

With regard to the Talleyrand MS., the *Nation* conjectures: "If this opinion reached Washington, it is not strange that he should have cut loose from Randolph." But permit me to remind you, as Washington reminded Randolph, that it was Randolph who cut loose from the President. Let me also call your attention to a letter, cited in my chapter on "Mr. Wolcott," of July 30, 1795. It was written by Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury, to Hamilton in New York, and proves that Hamilton was kept in ignorance of the existence of the intercepted despatch until after the explosion; consequently he could not have submitted the despatch to Talleyrand until too late for any opinion of the latter to affect the case. Another letter of Wolcott to Hamilton, of November 16, 1795, enclosed a copy of the Fauchet despatch, which was probably not in Hamilton's possession until then.

It is said in the *Nation* of Talleyrand's opinion that "there is no reason for supposing that it was biassed against Randolph." But it may be seen in my Life of Randolph (p. 233) that Talleyrand had strong grounds for animosity towards Randolph. Talleyrand had brought from London a letter of introduction to the Secretary of State (Randolph), apparently from Jay (though Jay denied having written it). Knowing that any attentions paid to Talleyrand would be offensive to France, Randolph did not honor the introduction, and by his advice the President declined to receive Talleyrand, who seems, indeed, not to have met any member of the Government in Philadelphia. A letter in the Duc de Broglie's Memoirs of Talleyrand proves his expectation of meeting the President, and the disappointment could not fail to be humiliating. He was fully informed that his exclusion was due to Randolph's advice. It was while still smarting under this humiliation that Talleyrand wrote the critique on the Minister who had been the means of that humiliation. Randolph had acted from purely public motives, and a magnanimous man would not allow any personal grievance to influence his criticism; but Talleyrand was without magnanimity; he is rightly pronounced in the *Nation* (July 6, p. 16) an adept in duplicity, coldly relentless, despicable in meanness.

According to your abstract of Talleyrand's critique on Fauchet's despatch, there are traceable in it the characteristics ascribed to him in the succeeding number of the *Nation*, just quoted. In my Life of Randolph, documentary evidence is given that Hamilton's honor was not admitted to the secret of those who in Philadelphia were hunting down Randolph. His submission of the despatch to Talleyrand suggests that he was not satisfied about the treat-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of Randolph (who had done Hamilton a great personal service). Unfortunately Hamilton did not understand French, and Talleyrand was able to pay off the fallen Secretary, who had humiliated him, by reading into the Fauchet despatch just what would turn a man of honor completely against Randolph. Assuming your résumé of Talleyrand's manuscript to be correct, he boldly falsifies Fauchet's despatch, making it incriminate Randolph on a point where it does not refer to Randolph at all. Talleyrand is thus summarized in the *Nation* on the point referred to: "What these confessions [of Randolph] were, Fauchet does not directly state; but he says they were of such a nature that they could not be made to Randolph's colleagues, who had a known bias for the Government and passions and interests with its chief. Is there a country on earth, says Talleyrand, where such confessions would not be regarded as a ministerial crime (*délit*) of the first order, etc." One can imagine the horror of Hamilton at this evidence of a Cabinet Minister concealing things from his colleagues because of their loyalty to his and their chief (Washington) and to the Administration in which he holds high office! But there is not the shade of a shadow of any such statement in Fauchet's despatch (which is printed verbatim in my Life of Randolph, in the original French). There is not a sentence that by any interpretation could suggest that Randolph had concealed, or was concealing, anything from his colleagues. The statement of Talleyrand is a travesty of what Fauchet says about his own colleagues in the French Embassy, of whom there were two. He explains to his Government at Paris that he had not communicated Randolph's confidences to his (Fauchet's) colleagues ("Je ne les ai point communiqués encore à mes collègues"), because of their bias, etc. Nothing is said of Randolph's colleagues, or of his or their "chief." On this pure falsification of Fauchet's despatch is based Talleyrand's only substantial charge of treachery against Randolph, and, having given credit to it, I do not wonder that the *Nation* finds it making short work with my defence of Randolph.

As for what Talleyrand says about the "overtures," alleged by Fauchet to have been made to him by Randolph, there appears nothing at all which affects my statements on that point. Granting that they were made (preposterous as the supposition seems), it is mere assumption to call them "corrupt propositions." That begs the question. They would not necessarily be any more corrupt than the overtures made by our patriotic fathers to France for money to defeat the English.

I hope, in the near future, to bring all question of Randolph, based on Fauchet's despatch, to an end, by the publication of extracts from the documents already alluded to as discovered since my 'Life of Randolph' appeared. There are other despatches of Fauchet, the most important being those intercepted along with No. 10, for which Randolph inquired so anxiously, and for which many have searched. I could not, even if prepared, deal with these documents at the close of a letter already needing your indulgence, but add my conviction that had they not been suppressed by Randolph's pursuers (who had them in Philadelphia), their whole case against him would have been quashed. Fauchet bitterly confessed his discovery that Randolph's "précieuses confessions" were all pretended.

MONCURE D. CONWAY.

LONDON, August 29, 1893.

[It would require more space than we can now afford to show that we spoke advisedly.—ED. NATION.]

THE "RUINS" OF JAMESTOWN, VA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A gentleman formerly of Dayton, Ohio, now a resident on the banks of James River, has become the owner of the site of James City, the first port in English North America. With commendable energy he has built a new steamboat wharf, improved the old Ambler plantation house, and given the old graveyard to an Antiquarian Society. Last month a newspaper writer possessing the peculiar gift of Capt. John Smith of seeing what no one else ever saw, reported that there had recently been discovered several long and narrow brick passageways under the earth, supposed to be used by the early colonists as hiding-places from the Indians. The manager of improvements at Jamestown, contradicting this Munchausen story in the Virginia *Gazette*, printed at Williamsburg, writes: "Let us have the truth regarding Jamestown and nothing but the truth."

The truth is, there are no ruins of old Jamestown visible. The ruins seen by the traveller as he ascends the James River are of a fortification that was above the town. An old earthen fort in the town was demolished more than two hundred years ago. Francis Moryson (also written Morrison), as agent for Virginia in the days of Gov. Berkeley, went to England and applied for aid to build a fort, but was unsuccessful. After the attack by Dutch ships-of-war an association was formed and a contract made with Drummond and Howe to build a defence. On the 27th of May, 1673, in consequence of a complaint made to the General Court, the contractors mentioned that they had brought bricks to the site, but had not commenced the work. Clayton, the Rector of Jamestown, as late as 1686 refers to the new defences in a letter to Robert Boyle, the philosopher. He writes that "they have built a silly sort of fort, that is a brick wall in the shape of a half moon, that seems little better than to shoot wild ducks or geese."

Additions were made by Gov. Andros; and James Blair, who, after Clayton's return to England, became Rector, and whose name is inseparably associated with the founding of William and Mary College in 1697, wrote that the fortifications were above the town. His words alluding to Andros were:

"He has thrown away a great deal of money in raising an old fort at Jamestown, and in building a powder-house, and in making a platform for great guns. I never heard one man that pretended to understand anything of fortifications, that upon sight of these works did not ridicule or condemn them as good for nothing, but to spend money. The guns are so placed that they are no defence of the town, which, *being much lower in the river*, might be taken by the enemy's shipping without receiving the least assistance."

EDWARD D. NEILL.

ST. PAUL, MINN., September 4, 1893.

NILE CORVÉE AND EGYPTIAN PRISONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: On July 16, the *Pall Mall Gazette* published an interview with Sir C. Scott-Moncrieff, in reference to that question of the Nile *corvée* which was discussed in the *Nation* of April 21 and November 17 of last year. It challenged me to show that this forced, unfed, and unpaid labor existed, at any rate in a form which was in any sense a hardship. "Mr. Cope Whitehouse claims that we have in no wise abolished the *corvée;* but he will find it hard to get round Sir Colin Moncrieff's evidence." To this I responded that I had no intention of trying to "get round" the statement of the former Under-Secretary of State for Public Works in Egypt, and said, quoting verbatim the summary given by Sir C. Scott-Moncrieff:

"It is absolutely false to say that, 'distinct from the *corvée* and entirely independent of it, there obtains in Egypt a system of voluntary State labor, organized entirely by the villagers themselves, who do their work ungrudgingly and in a patriotic spirit'; the whole subject is regulated by the Khedivial decree of August 6, 1885, passed on the demand of Sir C. Scott-Moncrieff himself."

Now, could there be more conclusive proof of the shameless effrontery and impudent falsehood of the assertion that the Nile *corvée* is a form of voluntary and patriotic service, gladly rendered in true fraternal spirit, than the following quotations from the English organ in Cairo, the *Egyptian Gazette*, August 16, 1893?

"The *corvée* labor for watching the Nile banks was called out yesterday." "We hear that the prisons are now full again. An additional strain on the resources of the prisons has been furnished *in former years* by the men who are sentenced to imprisonment for refusing to conform to the regulations in force for providing labor for watching the Nile banks. These men have been sent in, *from fifty to one hundred at a time*, to the Mooderiyeh [provincial] prisons. Provision for the contravention cases [misdemeanors] in connection with the *corvée* will have to be made this year independently of the Mooderiyeh prisons, which are incapable of accommodating *the extra numbers resulting from this cause*."

As the result of my efforts, payment of half wages (10 cents a day) is to be made in two districts. Let no one be deceived. Out of one hundred thousand "free" inhabitants of Egypt compelled to work for three months, not two thousand will get any wages at all. Apply this text to a score of other pretended reforms, and the value of an Englishman's evidence as to what he claims to have done in Egypt will be treated with the scorn it deserves. England wishes to be deceived, *decipiatur;* but that does not apply to America.

COPE WHITEHOUSE.

LONDON, September 4, 1893.

Notes.

FORDS, HOWARD & HULBERT will shortly issue 'The Pilgrim in Old England: Being a Review of the History, Present Condition, and Outlook of the Independent (Congregational) Churches in England,' by the Rev. Amory H. Bradford, D.D.

'The Speeches and Addresses of William McKinley' is in the press of D. Appleton & Co., who announce also 'The Gilded Man (El Dorado), and Other Pictures of the Spanish Occupancy of America,' by A. F. Bandelier; 'General Johnston,' by Robert M. Hughes, in the "Great Commanders" series; 'The Personal Recollections of Werner von Siemens'; 'The Brontë Family in Ireland,' by Dr. William Wright; 'The Development of Mind in the Child,' by Prof. W. Preyer, of Jena; 'The Credentials of Science the Warrant of Faith,' by Prof. Josiah P. Cooke; 'Miniatures from Balzac's Masterpieces,' selected by F. T. Hill and S. P. Griffin; and 'Duffels,' a new story by Edward Eggleston.

Pegasus in harness is perhaps too violent a metaphor, but a delicate talent engaged upon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

piece-work—that is the impression one receives from the dainty little volume, called 'Picture and Text,' in which the Harpers have reprinted some half-dozen short essays by Henry James. With two exceptions, they are strictly of the obligato sort—magazine articles on artists, intended as accompaniments to a selection of their works or to an engraved portrait, an introduction to the catalogue of a special exhibition, etc. It has never been Mr. James's method to say bluntly what he thinks, and here we have again the leisurely circumlocution, the unfinished hints at meanings, the maze of parentheses, the pretty choice of words, that mark the master's technic. The danger of this habit of writing around a subject—of the art of not saying it—to the writer himself is obvious. How far it may lead him even from grammar is shown in a remarkable sentence on page 49, where, in the labyrinth of clauses, Mr. James absolutely forgets that his subject is "the eighteenth century," and couples with it the verb "are."

'Clear Round' (London: S. Low, Marston & Co.), by E. A. Gordon, consists apparently of letters written by a mother to her children during a journey around the world. They are marred by the constant endeavor to enforce some religious truth in connection with the descriptions of strange scenes. The information, too, is sometimes very queer. For instance, writing of the muskrat, Mrs. Gordon says: "Chicago, on the south of Lake Michigan, means the 'city of the skunk,' and there the rats are so powerful that they have tunnelled through the marble wainscots and floors of the City Hall" (p. 33). The water of Lake Superior is "so intensely cold that if a ship founders the passengers have little chance of life, for they are instantly benumbed" (p. 28). The "firewater" with which the Americans have "killed off thousands" of Indians, is a "mixture of rum, tobacco, vitriol, and bluestone" (p. 37). The chief advantage of the projected railway from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay is that by this route it is "fifteen thousand miles nearer Liverpool than by New York" (p. 54). Grizzly and cinnamon "bears' forelegs being shorter than their hind, they escape pursuit by turning somersaults down hill and rolling themselves into a ball" (p. 81). The account of Japan, though not so entertaining as that of this country, is well written, and offers many attractive pictures of out-of-door life in that land. The chapters on China, India, and Egypt tell an old story and will hardly awaken much interest. There are a few fair illustrations, and an inserted map of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

'Round the Black Man's Garden' (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons), by Zélie Colvile, F.R.G.S., is a bright, chatty account of an unusual journey. Starting from Suez, this lady went as far as Zanzibar in coasting steamers which touched at various ports in Asia and Africa. Suakin was being besieged by Osman Digna, and this made the two or three days' stay there somewhat exciting. From Zanzibar Mrs. Colvile sailed to the east coast of Madagascar and crossed the island by way of the capital. The description of this part of the journey forms by far the most interesting chapter of the book. The peculiar scenery, the methods of travelling, the paths, the natives, are delineated with great vivacity, as is also a strange ceremony in the palace, the Feast of the Bath, during which the Queen is supposed to bathe in the presence of her people. Mrs. Colvile lays much stress on the peculiar mixture of civilization and barbarity among the Hovas, the ruling race in Madagascar. When she gets upon the more familiar ground of Kimberley and Pretoria, the interest of her narrative naturally slackens, but it revives again when she reaches the west coast of the continent. Here she visited some of the most interesting ports, going as far south as the Gaboon River. As was to be expected, her account, especially of Liberia, contains little that is encouraging, so far as the negroes are concerned. There is an excellent route-map and one of Central Madagascar.

The Librairies-Imprimeries Réunies (Paris) have brought out another volume of Victor Hugo's 'Toute la Lyre,' not a very happy title. Happily this is the last of the series, though by no means, it is to be feared, the last of the posthumous volumes, the poet's literary executors having apparently resolved to publish every line of Hugo's manuscript they can find. There is nothing in the present volume that adds to our knowledge of Hugo as a man or that presents him in any new aspect as a poet. There is not even anything equal to some of the second-best pieces in 'Les Contemplations'; and since nothing will be added to the poet's fame by the verses here collected, their publication can be accounted for only by the mania which Brunetière has named "la fureur de l'inédit."

The publishing house of Charpentier started, two or three years ago, a series of novels intended to be so absolutely pure that they might be read even by young girls. Some very charming volumes have appeared in this series, and its success has apparently stirred rival publishers to emulation. It is now thought desirable to have a home literature which shall rival the rich literature of England—if possible. The "if" is significant, as the perusal of 'Cœur Fermé,' by C. Troussart, in Armand Colin & Cie.'s collection for young unmarried women, will prove. It is the ordinary French novel of married life toned down so far that the heroine is actually pure and entertains merely a platonic affection for another gentleman than her husband. But scenes and incidents are much the same as in the ordinary romance of the day, and the morality of the book is not easily discernible. Possibly it lurks somewhere, deftly concealed by art.

A "History of Elections in the American Colonies" is contributed to the Columbia College series of studies by Mr. Cortlandt F. Bishop. The subject is sufficiently technical, but Mr. Bishop has collected many details which have color as well as significance for the student of our political development.

The study of the Basque language has not yet obtained recognition at any of the universities either abroad or on this continent. Some scholars have taken it up in connection with other linguistic work; very few have given it concentrated or continuous attention. One of these few is Mr. E. S. Dodgson, who has recently published at Alençon a small pamphlet, 'The Basque Verb Found and Defined.' The whole work, of which this is but a small portion—another portion appeared in the *Revue de Linguistique* for 1890 and 1891—is a concordance of the forms of the Basque verb occurring in the New Testament of Jean de Leiçarraga, printed at La Rochelle in 1571. The present pamphlet confines itself to the three Epistles of St. John. Other portions will follow as Mr. Dodgson proceeds with his work. The citations from the text are accompanied by the corresponding words of Calvin's French version of 1565, on which Leiçarraga based his translation. The great complexity of the verb in Basque makes it, in a way, the open-sesame to the language. Mr. Dodgson's work, when completed, will be of no little value to the Basque student.

In the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* for September, first number of the second volume, the most notable paper is President Walker's Phi Beta Kappa address of June last, on College Athletics. It takes what we may call a soldier's view of the advantages of the peculiar physical and moral discipline of our college sports, while curiously belittling the college ideals of Gen. Walker's own generation which fought with him in the civil war. These men are generally held to have acquitted themselves pretty well without the aid of tournaments and "records," and it is not just to say that with them "speech-making, debating, or fine writing were [was] the be-all and the end-all of college training." Their object in going to college was the cultivation of the intellect, primarily for its own sake, and this is still the noblest excuse for the existence of colleges. Such an aim was not due to the "transcendentalism" or "sentimentalism" of this or the preceding century, but was the wholesome unbroken tradition from the beginning of our colleges. It is athletics which have reversed the natural order of things, so that, by Gen. Walker's own confession, "it will soon be fairly a question whether the letters B.A. in the college degree stand more for Bachelor of Arts or for Bachelor of Athletics." Gen. Walker points out two evils to be abolished: organized cheering, and the further pursuit of athletics (*i. e.*, of "glory") by members of the professional schools.

The Henry M. Phillips prize of $500 will be awarded by the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia in 1895 to essays handed in before January 1, 1895, on the following subjects: (1) The sources, formation, and development of what is generally designated the Common Law of England; (2) the theory of the State, treated historically and upon principles, with a discussion of the various schools of classical, mediæval, and modern thought upon the subject; (3) the historical and doctrinal relations of the Roman law and the English law, illustrated by parallels and contrasts. The essays must be sent, with motto and sealed envelope containing the writer's name, to Frederick Fraley, President of the Society, at No. 104 South Fifth Street, Philadelphia. They may be written in English, French, German, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, or Latin; but an English translation must be appended to the foreign writing.

—Virginia and half of the States in the Union combined show no more cities of over 20,000 inhabitants than are to be found in Massachusetts. This fact is not readily apparent from the census bulletins thus far issued, as in none of them are cities having a less population than 25,000 ranged according to their populational rank. The fact is also so surprising that few persons will believe it without proof. But there is no place at all with so many inhabitants as 20,000 in nine States, viz., Vermont, Florida, Mississippi, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Nine States again have each no more than one town numbering over 20,000 people. Those States are New Hampshire, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oregon. Four other States, viz., Maine, Nebraska, Colorado, and Washington, count each only two cities that have passed the 20,000 limit. These three classes of States amount to twenty-two, that is, to half the whole number of the United States, and seventeen is the total of their cities

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with each a census upwards of 20,000. Twenty such cities, however, are in the roll of Massachusetts. These are Boston, Worcester, Lowell, Fall River, Cambridge, Lynn, Lawrence, Springfield, New Bedford, Somerville, Holyoke, Salem, Chelsea, Haverhill, Brockton, Taunton, Gloucester, Newton, Malden, Fitchburg. Three cities of this size, and no more, appear in the census of Virginia, viz., Richmond, Norfolk, and Petersburg.

—This comparison is too suggestive to need any remark concerning the strange distribution of our people, and the modern trend to urban residence, preëminently in manufacturing, free, commercial States and those long settled. It is further worth notice that the twenty cities just mentioned in Massachusetts are a larger number than can be discovered in any other State, though five States have a larger census. While the population of Massachusetts is three-fourths of a million less than half that of New York, her cities of the 20,000 class are more by two; those in Pennsylvania are only sixteen, those in Ohio ten, in Illinois seven, in Missouri four. Bulletin No. 116, in which cities are set down according to population, stops at No. 124, La Crosse, the smallest over 25,000. If continued to the smallest over 20,000, like that of 1880, it would have enabled us to compare the growth of the decade much more easily. To know the *relative* size of cities is most important. Every town likes to think itself equal to its superiors and superior to its equals, and no vulgar error is more rife. The most effectual cure for such "thinking of ourselves more highly than we ought to think," is to ascertain how many towns in the country are larger than our own, and what town is next smaller and next larger than that.

—The Training School for Nurses in Kyoto, Japan, is one of the best enterprises instituted and maintained by the American missionaries. Its seventh annual report has lately reached us, and we see at once that the work has passed beyond the stage of experiment. The text of thirty pages is reinforced by nine full-page reproductions of photographs showing the grounds, edifices, floor plans, the front page of the *Doshisha Hospital Messenger*, and, in one group, the Committee, staff, pupils, and employees. The veteran medical missionary of nearly twenty years of service, and profound student of Buddhism, John C. Berry, is in charge, but the best work in training the Japanese women is done by Miss Eliza Talcott. Abandoning the old and visionary idea of quickly converting the Japanese nation *en masse*, the purpose is now to thoroughly transform the individual. In the hospital connected with the Doshisha University patients are treated (and the medical and surgical statistics are here given); but, besides the influence that may be exerted upon them while in the wards, the various alumni of nurses and nursed are kept in unity of purpose (*doshisha*) by the *Hospital Messenger*. This newspaper is devoted to hygiene, practical nursing in the home, hospital news, religious instruction, temperance, whereabouts of the nurses, etc. Candidates for the School of Nurses must be at least twenty-two years of age, measured by Western style, which means from the day of birth, and not from January 1, or New Year's day. After a month of probation and examination in the fundamentals of a plain education, the candidate, if quick in perception and careful in observation, is matriculated. The curriculum is one that satisfies very rigid requirements. The students take solemnly a modified form of the Hippocratic oath. Of the thirty-six graduates of the school, some have married or died, but twenty-six are still active nurses, unable to supply fully the demand for their services. A study of the twenty or more faces of the young women in the present classes, arrayed in their snowy caps, aprons, and dresses, is very suggestive, and helps to confirm the almost impregnable optimism of those who have been educationally connected with the Japanese. A class of ten was graduated in June. The hospital treated over a thousand more cases than in the previous year. We notice that except two missionary clergymen on the Advisory Committee, and two American ladies, all the members of the staff, employees, and committee, are Japanese, among whom are several graduates of American universities. Besides the voluntary work of the nurses in district and village evangelization, it is becoming a feature of some of the native Christian churches to employ a district nurse as part of the organized work of the congregation in practical religion.

—The question of an elevated stage in the early Greek theatre cannot be considered settled by the completed report of the excavations at Megalopolis which have lately appeared in an elaborately illustrated quarto. This theatre is interesting for various reasons, and particularly because it was supposed to afford evidence of a fourth-century stage, elevated four or five feet above the level of the orchestra. No remains of such a stage are found; but its existence, or at least the use of a temporary wooden platform, was inferred from the architectural conditions. Mr. Ernest Gardner still adheres to this opinion, but his coadjutor, Mr. Loring, adds a final note in which he declares that the technical evidence for a fourth-century stage derived from marks of tooling in the various structures of the building, does not seem to him so conclusive as he had supposed when he signed the report. Since, therefore, the two experts who are most familiar with the technical evidence disagree, the matter remains *sub lite*. A curious exception is found in the later proscenium at Megalopolis (which the excavators have called the "proscenium of Vitruvius") to the ordinary rule in Greek theatres. The proscenium here has no central door, no exit upon the orchestra, and is the solitary instance known in which this deficiency occurs. Dr. Dörpfeld has hitherto maintained that the central door in the proscenium clearly served as an exit for the actors upon the level of the orchestra, and that the object of the proscenium wall was therefore simply as a scenic background, not, as Mr. Haigh and many others suppose, to support an elevated stage. The English excavators point to the proscenium at Megalopolis as an important exception, tending to show that Vitruvius was correct in his surprising statement that the Greek stage, or λογεῖον, was not less than ten or twelve feet high.

—A small pamphlet by Mr. Edward Capps of the Chicago University gives a very clear résumé of the many opinions which have been advanced in connection with the Greek stage, and discusses a new interpretation which Mr. Louis Dyer has lately given to this much vexed passage of Vitruvius. Mr. Dyer quotes the commentary of Fra Giocondo, a Florentine architect, writing about the year 1500 A. D., and deduces from his diagrams and from the language of the Roman architect the conclusion that Vitruvius conceived of the Greek theatre as having a long narrow proscenium or masked front, from the centre of which projected a narrow movable platform for actors (the pulpitum, or λογεῖον), to which he wrongly gave the same height as the proscenium. Such a platform of a moderate height has been suggested by many scholars, and would be a convenient solution of a perplexing problem. Mr. Capps holds, however, that Mr. Dyer's understanding of Giocondo is strained and improbable, and one cannot help agreeing with him in this belief. Mr. Capps concludes that there is no other way of understanding Vitruvius than as meaning what Mr. Haigh and most scholars have actually taken him to mean, viz., that the Greek stage was ten or twelve feet high, and consequently that the actors performed on a perilous ledge, varying from six to twelve feet in width. Mr. Capps dares to call this "a discreditable blunder." From so irreverent an accusation Vitruvius may, perhaps, shield himself behind the proscenium at Megalopolis.

A TEXT-BOOK OF ENGLISH HISTORY.

English History for American Readers. By Thomas Wentworth Higginson, author of 'Young Folks' History of the United States,' and Edward Channing, Assistant Professor of History in Harvard University. Longmans, Green & Co. 1893.

Mr. John Fiske has already contributed no little towards making the general public understand the significance for universal history of the great political experiment in which this country is engaged; and it is as an attempt to propagate another great idea—the continuity of English and American history—that the book which has just appeared from Col. Higginson and Prof. Channing calls most loudly for our attention. The authors justly remark in their preface that since "it is not the practice of American readers, old or young, to give to English history more than a very limited portion of their hours of study," "such readers will use their time to the best advantage if they devote it mainly to those events in English annals which have had the most direct influence on the history and institutions of our own land." Accordingly they "have boldly ventured to modify in their narrative the accustomed scale of proportion." They have done wisely. We may go further and add that the very fact that they are not themselves Englishmen gives them a certain aloofness, a certain independence in their view of recent events, such as those who are connected with either of the great English political parties find it hard to maintain. The book may therefore be of value to Englishmen, as well as to Americans, as expressing the opinion of intelligent outsiders. The gift is here given them of seeing themselves as others see them—for instance, in regard to the Irish Land Laws.

Excellent, however, as the work is in conception, one could wish that the execution had been such as to arouse more enthusiasm. One could wish that the style were more vigorous: that there were more glow, more movement, more consecutive interest in the pages. As the elimination of the unimportant has gone so far, one could wish that it had gone further—that no fact had been mentioned simply because it was important, unless the context showed *why* it was important. Yet the merits of the work are so considerable, the reputation of its authors so high, the mechanical execution of the book, and especially the illustrations, so attractive, that it is certain to be widely used. Not that it is quite evident for whom it is intended. The preface speaks of "readers old or young"; and there are occasional reflections above the youthful mind,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the scanty space given to the explanation of principles, and the simplicity of the language, which occasionally even condescends to the phraseology of the nursery, lead one to conclude that, like the earlier work of one of its authors, it is addressed to "young folks." It would, indeed, be a pity if it should prevent the use among those at all capable of benefiting by them of either Gardiner's 'Student's History' or Green's 'Short History.' The first of these is the thoughtful journeywork of a man who, in his own period, the seventeenth century, is a really great historian; the second is at any rate literature. Neither contains much that the intelligent young man about to enter college ought to find unintelligible; and he will have no difficulty himself in adapting what he finds there to the needs of an American.

This history, however, of Messrs. Higginson and Channing will doubtless find its way into the hands of thousands of young folks; and as that is so, and the publisher will certainly be bringing out further editions, it will be well to call the attention of the authors to a number of blemishes which in an ordinary school-book one would pass over without notice. And first—to get over the most distasteful part of the task—concerning a certain number of mistakes in unessential matters of fact. "The head"—we must understand the *ecclesiastical* head, for the sovereign is *the* head—"the head of the Church of England" has not "ever since" Augustine's time "had a palace" at Canterbury (p. 16); his palace is at Lambeth. If the Conqueror "inscribed the names of the Norman knights who fought" at Hastings "*on*" Battle Abbey (p. 25), that is a fact quite unknown to Mr. Freeman. To state that Edward I. "confirmed the charters" at Ghent "with the additional promise that he would not *lay a tax* without the common consent of the nation" (p. 54), makes the King concede more than he did, and ignores the distinction which Dr. Stubbs has dwelt on between the language of the real *Confirmatio* and that of the document known as *De tallagio non concedendo*. It is inacurate to say that "the English navy has been powerful and famous ever since" Henry V. (p. 81), and inconsistent with the truer statement (p. 132) that at the time of the Armada "England had nothing properly to be called a navy." Cranmer was not appointed archbishop of Canterbury after Warham "resigned" (p. 104), but upon Warham's death. "Six statutes, called the Six Acts, passed in 1539" (p. 108) instead of the "act of the Six Articles"—already corrected in the index—should not be allowed to remain in the text. Rogers, one of the Marian martyrs, was not a bishop (p. 117), but a canon of St. Paul's.

Then there are a few passages which, defensible in themselves, are pretty sure to lead the average young reader astray. The first would perhaps hardly matter. In telling the story of Alfred and the cakes our authors say:

"She said to him, according to an old ballad—

> 'There, don't you see the cakes on fire!
> Then wherefore turn them not,'" etc. (p. 18).

The youthful mind will be apt to think that these are the actual words of an old ballad, while, as a matter of fact, they are Mr. Freeman's own verse translation of a Latin distich which he conjectures to be based upon a ballad. He will be a clever boy, also, who understands the statement that each gild "took full charge of all goods made by its members" (p. 75) in a correct sense. Sadly mistaken would the reader be who drew from the words "Nor would Elizabeth consent to the marriage of the clergy" (p. 123) the natural conclusion that during her reign it was not allowed. "Parliament still has the substantial control of Canada in its own hands, and by merely passing an act can any day alter this whole arrangement," *i. e.*, the present self-government (p. 299), is true in much the same sense as it would be to say that the Electoral College could exercise freedom in choosing a President, or that the Queen could employ her power of veto. And, to fall back once more on trifles, to describe army purchase as "the system of allowing officers to choose their own rank by purchasing a commission" (p. 320) will call up the picture of ensigns leaping into majorities, and lieutenants suddenly becoming colonels; and the miserable system was not quite so bad as that.

From these we pass to a number of statements which are perfectly clear in themselves, and for which some sort of ground can be shown, but which we may not be without hope that the authors will see their way to modify on further consideration. As before, we will take them in the order in which they occur, without regard to their relative importance. That the ancient "Britons were good farmers and raised large crops of grain" (p. 4) would seem, to put it moderately, a somewhat too general statement, when we remember the contrast which Cæsar expressly draws between the inhabitants of "the maritime part" and the rest of the population. We must not quarrel with the statement that, when the English tribes settled down, "the affairs of the township were arranged at a meeting of the male freeholders" (p. 13), for that delightfully simple view of constitutional and social antiquities has of late become the accepted creed of the text-book writers, and still occupies the field; but we may criticise the further statement that, "after Christianity was introduced, this 'town-moot' or 'town-meeting' *took charge of* the religious affairs too, and did this under the name of 'parish'" (p. 14). Probably the township area became for ecclesiastical purposes the parish, but it is not till very long "after Christianity was introduced" that there is any evidence of the town-meeting "taking charge" of "religious affairs." To lay down that "at first the freemen had a right to attend the meetings of the Witenagemot" (p. 15), though loyal to Freeman, is in the teeth of Stubbs, in whose judgment most scholars certainly now acquiesce. Then, the balance-of-trade idea seems a little antedated (p. 74), and the distinction between the earlier and later Middle Ages in that respect not sufficiently borne in mind.

"Henry IV. was really a usurper, and ruled *merely* as being the King elected by Parliament" (p. 77), and "the Duke of York's right to the English crown was better than that of the reigning king" (p. 84), are surprisingly Legitimist utterances, and will puzzle the young folks who have duly perpended the dictum that, by the manner of Richard the Second's fall, "it was established that the nation might depose the King if it wished" (p. 72). The evils of "maintenance" and "livery," closely connected as they were, should not be absolutely identified with one another (as on p. 78). The account given (p. 85) of the significance of the restriction in the reign of Henry VI. of the right of suffrage to forty-shilling freeholders follows Green with fidelity; but it might be well to reconsider it in the light of Stubbs's discussion of the point. The explanation of Puritanism (p. 125) dwells only on the Vestiarian Controversy, and hardly brings into sufficient prominence the question of church government. From the reference to the "disregarding" of the Petition of Right (p. 157), and the use of the word "tax" without explanation (p. 154), we gather that our authors have failed to follow Mr. Gardiner's argument as to the adroit but scarcely justifiable contention of the parliamentary opposition concerning tunnage and poundage. The Resolution of 1629 as to religion our authors limit to a declaration against the introducers of "new ceremonies" (p. 157), and of course the sturdy common sense of American young folks will sympathize with the opposition; but the persons actually condemned were "whosoever shall bring in *innovation* in religion, or by favour seek to extend or introduce Popery or *Arminianism* or other *opinions* disagreeing from the true and orthodox church," and no narrative approaches completeness which does not explain the extent to which the church movement which the Puritans opposed was, with all its faults, a movement towards greater intellectual freedom. The second word italicized may be especially commended to the attention of Methodist readers.

Two paragraphs which need more than a word of criticism we have kept to the last. To state the characteristics of the reign of Elizabeth is a crucial test for an historian, and Messrs. Higginson and Channing have not been notably successful. The passage runs:

"Elizabeth gave to England a long period of comparative peace, at a time when *great inventions and discoveries were coming into common use*, and while England's *commercial rivals were engaged in the most destructive of all wars*, those for religion. . . . This period of growth also enabled England to take that *lead in commerce* and the arts of peace *which she has ever since maintained*. Elizabeth's reign, too, is renowned as the time of Shakespeare and the other writers of the Golden Age of English literature. *More important, perhaps, than the progress in these various directions* [*i. e.*, including literature] *were the reforms in the administration* of the Government" (p. 121).

One would like to know what the "great inventions" were. Can gunpowder and the printing-press be meant? If so, the chronology is somewhat at fault. The implied contrast between war and commerce is current with modern radicals; but, as Mr. Seeley has shown, it is historically untrue. In Elizabeth's time Spain, indeed, suffered, but France soon recovered; and it was to the wars of religion, which enabled it to conquer the Portuguese East Indies, that Holland owed in great measure its commercial greatness. That England did not "take and retain" a lead in commerce is sufficiently proved by Adam Smith's celebrated observation with regard to the position of the Dutch at the date of the Navigation Act. And it would be interesting to hear what were the reforms in the administration that can be compared for importance with the glorious new birth of English literature.

The other sentences to which we referred are among the last in the book, and occur in a paragraph wherein the authors are laboring, very properly, no doubt, to impress upon their young readers that while England ought to be *most* interesting to Americans, other countries ought to be interesting also:

"At present our commerce is chiefly with England, and it is the English influence which is most strongly felt in our social habits and, to some extent, in our literature. On the other hand, *we draw* our art from France and *our science from Germany almost as completely as if England did not exist.*" (P. 326.)

Is not this protesting a trifle too much? Putting on one side the strong feeling of union between the great religious bodies on this side of the water and the other; putting on one side

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also the community of law, which is so great that in the Harvard Law School more regard is paid to English decisions than to those of any American States but Massachusetts and New York—and both these the authors would perchance put under "social habits"—what is to be said of the sentence as to science? Of course, it is sufficiently true to make as an after-dinner remark; every one knows how our would-be professors troop off to Germany. But to teach it in print to young folks in the age of Darwin and Spencer, of Lyell and Mill, of Huxley and Kelvin—not to mention such popularizers as Prof. Drummond with his worshipping audiences—shows hardly that perfectly balanced judgment which we have a right to look for.

But these criticisms have been concerned with more or less remediable matters of detail. With the general teaching of the book but little fault can be found. If it shows no remarkable freshness, or depth of philosophical insight, it at any rate presents the current Whig view in an unobjectionable form. James I. and Charles I., Strafford and Laud, are of course held up for the detestation of young folks in the usual way. It does not seem to have occurred to our authors that although, with the growth of an opulent middle class, a contest between Parliament and the monarchy was bound to come, although it was well that Parliament should triumph in the end, although the contest was embittered by the duplicity of Charles, nevertheless it would hardly have been well for England had the Opposition triumphed in 1629; that the subsequent history of Cromwell and the Independents shows defects in the government of Parliament and the Presbyterians almost as grave as in Tudor rule; that it was not until well-nigh a century had passed that the Cabinet was evolved and Parliament became capable of ruling. That this was a case in which, as so often in history, both parties were justified in struggling for a principle, and that the result was the better because of the struggle, is an idea which does not seem to have dawned upon them. And perhaps it is hopeless to expect the short text-book ever to be absolutely impartial and scientific. For impartiality means carefully guarded sentences; and carefully guarded sentences are not wont to be brief.

THE EMPIRE OF THE TSARS.

The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians. By Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu. Translated from the third French edition, with annotations by Zenaïde A. Ragozin. Part I. The Country and its Inhabitants. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

It is unnecessary for us, at this late day, to enter into a detailed discussion of the merits of M. Leroy-Beaulieu's great work, especially as we reviewed it adequately when it first appeared. We need only repeat here that it is the most extended, and, at the same time, the most satisfactory, of all the serious efforts made by foreigners to explain the phenomena of Russian life, politics, and character. Hitherto the great bulk of the book has deterred publishers from issuing a translation in English, and its valuable contents have, accordingly, remained inaccessible to the general public. It is somewhat surprising that it should have been thus neglected, when so many inaccurate and trivial works on the subject have flowed in a stream from the press, even when we consider that Mackenzie Wallace's capital volumes have, in a certain measure, filled the gap. But M. Leroy-Beaulieu's work is, in many respects, superior to Wallace's, though it does not supersede it; each is the complement of the other. Having thus stated broadly its merits, and assuming more intimate knowledge on the part of those who are acquainted with the original, it remains for us to consider this annotated translation of the first volume, which treats of the country and its inhabitants, and the author's preface to the American edition.

It is worth while to quote one or two of the author's remarks from his preface, as they bear upon the methods employed in the translation. He says:

"One thing I cannot too much impress upon my readers, and that is that we are not justified, we Westerners, in applying to Russia the same rules as to Europe or America. To do this would be the height of ignorance and unfairness. . . . Russia is neither Europe nor Asia, she is a world by itself [*sic*], situated between Europe and Asia, and, in a way, belonging to both. . . . Even tourists, as, with their habitual presumptuous flippancy, they steam by express across the Russian plains, are struck by this anomaly. . . . However remote this ponderous Russian people may appear to us, however backward its civilization and its institutions may seem to us, this newcomer among nations has already manifested an original genius in all branches of human activity—in arts, in science, in letters. . . . Let us, then, whether we call ourselves Neo-Latins or Anglo-Saxons, beware of the inane race-pride which is too often aired by the Teuton on the Elbe and the Vistula, towards the Slav. The Slav has by no means had his final say—indeed, he has scarcely yet lisped his first words. Because he is different from us, and because nature and history have retarded his development, we are not to pronounce him doomed to everlasting inferiority. Such presumption may bring its own punishment. To show us that he has in him the stuff that goes to make a great people, all the Russian Slav needs is a chance and a couple of centuries' credit."

In these remarks M. Leroy-Beaulieu shows his usual discrimination and judgment, which have kept him from useless details in the body of his work, and which hint at the necessity for fulness of explanation and illustration to enable non-Russians to comprehend the unwonted situations and strange people. It is a great pity, therefore, that the translator of what will probably be the only issue of this important work, did not grasp the author's spirit. She confesses frankly that she has abridged the book throughout—"persistent compression," she terms it. In many cases, the result is a lack of clearness, if not absolute obscurity, a lack of precisely the delicate little touches the value of which the author so well understands, in bringing out the salient points of his pictures for those who come utterly uninformed to the subject. It is difficult to quote these often intricate cases, but, in the line of important and apt illustrations which have been omitted, we may point to that which shows the necessity for the study of racial, national character, on p. 138. The omissions are made to allow of space for the annotations. The question arises, Are the annotations, taken as a whole, equal in value to what they replace? It is, no doubt, very interesting to read the comments of an intelligent Russian on the author, but some of the notes are superfluous. Others are very good, such as that on p. 152, controverting one of the author's very rare errors on ventilation; those on pp. 70, 136, concerning German compulsion in the Baltic Provinces, and religious tolerance; that on p. 100, which contains an enlightening statement of Russian beliefs and hopes; and that on p. 249, setting forth why Russia's severance from Europe, at a critical period, which threw it back for centuries, was really a blessing instead of a curse, as is usually assumed. The appendices are generally of value, especially those on pp. 13, 237, which deal with N. Danilevsky's book, 'Russia and Europe.' While conceding the worth and interest of the translator's notes, we must think that it would have been better to give the whole of the text. The bulky volume, which is already much larger than the French, would not have been overweighted thereby. The addition of four maps, not contained in the original, must be heartily commended as a very valuable aid to study such as this book merits.

Of the translation in a technical sense, there is much to be said, both good and bad. The language is fluent, varied, the rendering is free, yet rarely too free. But there are marks of haste or carelessness, such as, p. 48, "the region round Odessa, before it bore the name of New Russia, received from its Serbian colonists that of New Siberia" (meaning Serbia). On p. 42, China is represented as striving "to wrest from the Russian colonists the possession of Siberia." To the heedless omission of the word "Eastern" before Siberia is due the serious misrepresentation of this sentence. Likewise, on p. 48: "These small Oriental colonies, some of them scarcely inferior in the matter of agriculture, have given their first impulse to the navy and to commerce." Had the missing words, "in the South," been added at the end of the phrase, it would not have seemed, as it now does, falsely, to apply to the whole empire. There are occasional very misleading errors of translation, such as naming the willow tree, which is not conspicuous among the notable trees of northern Russia, in place of the alder, as correctly stated by the author; the enormous alder trees being a distinctive feature in the landscape and of great value for certain uses. Again, the translator falls into the curious mistake of saying that the peasants' "staple food consists of rye bread *broken into* the *shtshi*," instead of "black bread, porridge [*gruau*], and *shtshi*." Her comments on food in general, and *shtshi* in particular, justify this quotation of her carelessness. "The child suffers from the difficulty of breathing the air" represents exactly the opposite of the author's meaning—taking out-door exercise.

But the most serious defect of the translation, and one which will be avoided, it is to be hoped, in the remaining volumes, is that arising from insufficient familiarity with the English language. Granted that it is a feat of which any foreigner may well be proud, to have translated such a book even so creditably as this, we have still a right to demand that a standard work should not fail in precisely the points where this is weak, both for the sake of preserving the purity of the language, and for the sake of conveying clearly the author's thoughts. The faults are of several sorts. We begin by specifying wrongly used or imperfectly rendered words: "precipitous race," for precipitate; "primeval," for primary; "platitude," for level; "co-temporary," "parallelly," "confining" for adjoining; "activate," for accelerate; "acception," for acceptation; "sectators," for sectarians; the "social status of Europe," for the "social condition of Europe; "impersonation," for personification; "scrofula is habitual," instead of frequent. A certain class of grammatical faults is illustrated by the following sentences: "To these free institutions the State substituted"; "Mr. Pobiedonostseff advises to adopt": "make out a difference"; "in proportion with"; "without sacrificing the ones to the others." Another class of grammatical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faults, which obscure the sense, arises from the fact that Russians are never able to master thoroughly the different past tenses of the English verb, no matter with what fluency and accuracy they may use the language in other respects. The present tenses also seem to be difficult: "Goes steadily decreasing," "a landholder was saying [said] to me," "serfdom was established as everywhere else it vanished" (when it was vanishing). "Russia was seen only through Poland, and was mostly known only from the pictures drawn by her adversaries" throws the date of the statement into the distant, completed past. *Has been seen, has been known* restore the sense to the ear and the mind. "Nihilism, which has made [made] so much noise from 1878 to 1883," offers another specimen of this Russian peculiarity. The Russian verb offers no assistance in such cases, but the French corresponds so nearly to the English form that there should have been no difficulty in this instance. The best illustration of the effect is given in the following sentence, p. 407:

"If literature in Russia has got very near to the people, it [has] too often approached it with preconceived views, seeking in it what it was determined to find. Some [have] fancied that they could discover in the hidden depths of the popular mind latent forces which they [have] opposed to the barrenness of the vaunted cultured of the upper classes; others, more scornful or more superficial, could [have been able to] see in the people's soul nothing but darkness and barbarism."

Passing lightly over the improper use of the undignified word "don't," and the interpolation on p. 11 of Alexander III.'s reputed remark, we come to a point which is likely to cause grave difficulty to all readers who are not already very well posted—as very few, comparatively, can be—on the history and nomenclature of Slavic lands and peoples. At times the translator gives the English equivalents, at times she converts the French form into the purely Russian term, or she uses different forms at different times, which is still more confusing. Sometimes the Christian name Feodor appears thus, sometimes as Theodor. Liefland is given for the name of the country, Livs for the people. Uniformity would have required either Livonia, Livs, or the full Russian, Liflyándiya, Liflyándetz. Lithuania and an inhabitant thereof would appear as Litvá, Litóvetz; Esthonia and an inhabitant as Estlyándia, Estónetz, if they are to correspond with even the compromise "Liefland." In any case, whichever form is once chosen should be strictly adhered to throughout. Mme. Ragozin furnishes the Russian forms Arkhangelsk, Kalmyk, but translates the French of Crimea and Caucasus, and changes Nice to Nizza. In the matter of Russian words equal confusion reigns as to the English and Russian plurals, both occurring at times in the same sentence: *Mujiki, mujiks; boyars*, and *drujinniki*, etc.

It is well that M. Leroy-Beaulieu's valuable book is, at last, to be put within the reach of English-speaking people, but it is a great pity that the translation, in many respects not only admirable but elegant, should not have been better. It is to be hoped that, in the two volumes which follow, a competent reviser will be employed.

The History of Music. By J. F. Rowbotham. Charles Scribner's Sons.

SOME years ago Mr. Rowbotham (whose 'Private Life of the Great Composers' was recently reviewed in these columns) issued a book in three volumes which he called 'A History of Music.' We have now a new edition of a shorter work on the same subject, to which he has given the title of 'The History of Music.' This title is utterly misleading; it should be 'An Introduction to Musical History,' or 'A Prehistoric Sketch of Music,' for it leaves off —without a word of apology or explanation— where music, as the word is understood to-day, really begins, namely, with the mediæval Arabians and the troubadours. Of the real art of European music, from Palestrina and Bach to Brahms, not a word is said! To call such a book 'The History of Music' is obviously a case of commercial immorality, for it may lead students to get what they do not want, in place of some complete sketch of musical history, like those of Langhans, Fillmore, Rockstro, Ritter, Riemann, Naumann, or the older German authorities.

Apart from this objection, there is much to be said in favor of the book. Unlike the German historians, Mr. Rowbotham does not begin his story with a few Greek legends about the origin of music, but goes back to savage peoples for the earliest traces of the art. He has carefully searched the volumes of anthropologists and ethnologic travellers, gathering from them many curious and suggestive bits of information as to the first manifestations of the musical instinct. Nor has he stopped at the compilation of facts, but he has endeavored to classify them under a theory which has much in its favor. According to this theory there are three stages in the development of prehistoric instrumental music—the drum stage, the pipe stage, and the lyre stage. The drum is capable of giving expression to the earliest of the musical elements—rhythm; the next element, melody, finds utterance through flute-like instruments, while the possibilities of harmony are provided by the lyre. The drum seems to us the simplest possible instrument, yet it is the result of thousands of years of experimenting, and the man who first thought of covering a hollowed-out log with a skin was in his way as great a genius in instrumentation as was Wagner when he invented new instruments to get clang-tints which he craved in his "Tristan" and "Nibelung" scores. It seems odd that by primitive peoples the simple, noisy drum should be used to express their joy and grief; but there are other and much more perfect instruments towards which our emotional attitude has changed with the progress of music. To us, for instance, a solo flute is the very incarnation of dry monotony and lack of expression, whereas the much less perfect pipes and flutes of antiquity moved their hearers to tears and deeds of extravagance in love and heroism. The Peruvians had a regular love-language for the flute, and among the ancient civilized nations, too, the flute had such effect on the feelings that Plato thought no modest woman should hear the Lydian pipe, and that flutes should be banished from the republic. As far as solo flutes are concerned, this is a consummation to be wished in our republic too, but on different grounds.

Of the music of the ancient Egyptians, Greeks, Hebrews, Romans, and of early Christian music, Mr. Rowbotham gives clear and concise accounts, with numerous details not usually found in manuals. Especially interesting is the chapter on the Chinese, in which is prominently brought out the odd fact that Chinese music is less concerned with sequences of notes, or melodies, than with the different qualities of sound, or what we chiefly have in mind when we speak of instrumentation. According to their system, there are eight musical sounds in nature, the sounds of skin, of stone, metal, baked earth, silk, wood, bamboo, gourd; and of these materials the various musical instruments are constructed. The sensuous element thus predominates in Chinese music. After quoting a famous Chinese piece, which to us seems a mere technical exercise, the author comments:

"To judge of the effect of such a piece as this, it is not sufficient to read the notes as they are written here; we must imagine the rich mellow tones of the musical stones, that are softer and sweeter than any gong or silver bell; we must try and fancy these strange notes dealt out like a shower of feathers—flakes of sound falling on the ear, so beautiful that musical notes disappear in the sensuous swell."

Usually, however, this "sensuous swell" of Chinese music—as exemplified in San Francisco—is more suggestive of a boiler factory than of "flakes of sound."

Mr. Rowbotham's theory as to the origin of the pentatonic scale is not convincing, and another criticism to be made is that he gives too much space to the complex Greek system of music, the learning of which is practically a waste of time, as there is no Greek music worth mentioning extant to-day. The same must be said about the minute details regarding the development of notation, Byzantine, Armenian, and otherwise. No one but a specialist has any use for such things, and a specialist would not be apt to consult a compilation of other men's labors. The trouble with Mr. Rowbotham is that he likes to air his erudition. For instance, one of his tricks is to give, after certain expressions, their equivalent in Greek, Latin, or German, in brackets; not, as Schopenhauer occasionally does, when the language he writes in fails to give his meaning to a shade of accuracy, but merely to impress the reader with his linguistic accomplishments. This same tendency has obviously led him to treat by preference those parts of musical history which are most technical, obscure, and uninteresting. Yet he has succeeded in providing students with a clear and readable summary; his style is usually excellent, and in some places, as when he describes the dismal chants and lugubrious musical antics preceding the expected end of the world in the year 1000, and the carnival of merriment, parody, and excess which followed the exposure of the sham prophecies, he even succeeds in giving a dramatic interest to his pages.

Sur Goethe: Études critiques de littérature allemande. Par J.-J. Weiss. Avec une préface de Francisque Sarcey. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.

THE title-page of this volume is calculated to excite high anticipations. A collection of essays upon Goethe by so eminent a Frenchman as the late M. Weiss, with a preface, too, by M. Sarcey, suggests large possibilities of delight. It is therefore a little disappointing to learn that M. Sarcey's preface is a very slight affair, interesting chiefly for its author's guileless admission that he is unacquainted with the language of "our neighbors beyond he Rhine," and knows nothing of their literature or philosophy except from translations. He is, however, confident that Mr. Weiss knew all about those things and was just the man to treat of them. The soundness of this opinion we do not presume to dispute, though we could have wished for fresher evidence on the subject than the studies here presented, all of which are ancient history. We have, in the first place, a reprint of the doctoral dissertation submitted by Weiss to the Paris Faculty of Letters, in 1856. It is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon 'Hermann und Dorothea.' One can read it with some pleasure, for it is cleverly written, but only a partial friend would claim for it any special merit either as scholarship or as criticism. It is a *causerie* about this and that, and abounds in rhetorical flights which have a strange sound in a doctor's dissertation. M. Sarcey praises it for its style, and says that it created a revolution in the Faculty of Letters. The dissertations of that day, we are told, were all of the heavy, erudite type, monuments of patience, industry, and—dulness. But Weiss came along and astonished the doctors with a thesis written in a light and incisive style and "sparkling with new views." M. Sarcey singles out for admiration the following passage, which we must give in the original, since the style is in question. The author is speaking a good word for "the love that leads to marriage":

"Il [l'amour] naît," says he, "par un élan irrésistible; il ne croit qu'à un seul être sur la terre; en lui seul il place le bonheur; hors de lui, il ne voit que des joies décolorées; il a ses alternatives d'espoir infini et d'angoisses, de confiance et de doute; des tourments se mêlent à ses joies; il est tout ensemble inquiet, résolu, timide, exigeant, puisque enfin c'est l'amour. Mais comme il se développe en des âmes actives, nourries jusque-là de sentiments sains et dès longtemps habituées à n'aimer que ce qui est bon, à ne regarder comme désirable que ce qui est légitime et possible, on n'a pas à craindre qu'il s'égare et use la vie en transports inutiles. La raison le tempère sans l'affaiblir; elle le guide sans le dépouiller de son charme de liberté juvénile; elle lui communique je ne sais quoi de fort, par quoi il saura se contenir lui-même et au besoin se vaincre."

"Is not this entire commentary exquisite? And how it explains the love of Hermann for Dorothea," exclaims M. Sarcey. For our part, we should think that the love of Hermann for Dorothea is in no need of such a commentary. We surmise that the author of it was not so much intent upon interpreting Goethe honestly as upon lecturing certain of his own countrymen, who were manifesting a strong literary *penchant* for the kind of love that does not lead to marriage. As a counter-blast to 'Mademoiselle de Maupin' the passage may be well enough—we will even let M. Sarcey call it "exquisite"—but not as a comment upon 'Hermann und Dorothea.'

The second essay is a reprint of a review, published in 1855, of a so-called "new translation of 'Dichtung und Wahrheit,' by the Baroness de Carlowitz. It is a good review of a worthless book. Two sentences are worth quoting, as showing the general view of Goethe's character at which Weiss had arrived, at a time when such views were much less common than they are now:

"It is thus that before the formal witness of Goethe's Memoirs and before the still more incontestable witness of his correspondence, all those accusations of egoism and of proud insensibility that have been directed against him, fall to the ground. His works as a whole, the more they are studied, will permit no further doubt of the morality of his genius."

The remaining essays, excepting half-a-dozen pages on the interview between Goethe and the first Napoleon, and a short letter dealing with the history of Werther literature in France, do not concern Goethe, but are miscellaneous reviews of German books published in the fifties. The longest and best—the introduction is a really brilliant piece of writing—is an elaborate critique of Freytag's "Soll und Haben."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Bennett, Prof. C. W. History of the Philosophy of Pedagogics. Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen. 50 cents.
Blackman, R. D. A Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations. 11th ed. London: C. W. Deacon & Co.; New York: Putnams.
Botsford, Prof. G. W. The Development of the Athenian Constitution. [Cornell Studies in Classical Philology.] Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.60.
Brontë, Emily and Anne. Wuthering Heights, and Agnes Grey. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Coryell, J. R. Diccon the Bold: A Story of the Days of Columbus. Putnams.
Daell, Prof. A. N. van. An Introduction to the French Language. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Ford, W. C. The Writings of George Washington. Vol. XIV. 1798-1799. Putnams. $5.
French, H. W. Oscar Peterson. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.50.
Grand, Sarah. Ideala. Appletons. $1.
Herron, Prof. G. D. The New Redemption. T. Y. Crowell & Co. 75 cents.
James, Henry. Essays in London and Elsewhere. Harpers. $1.25.
Knight, G. H. Patent-Office Manual. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. $5.
Macguire, Cathae. Amabel. Rand, McNally & Co. 75 cents.
Norman, J. H. A Ready Reckoner of the World's Foreign and Colonial Exchanges. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co.; New York: Putnams.
Ober, F. A. In the Wake of Columbus. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $2.50.
Poore, G. V. Essays on Rural Hygiene. Longmans, Green & Co. $2.
Rein, Prof. W. Outlines of Pedagogics. London: Sonnenschein; Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen. $1.25.
Rocheblave, S. Les Cochin. [Les Artistes Célèbres.] Paris: *L'Art*; New York: Macmillan.
Snider, D. J. Dante's Inferno: A Commentary. Chicago: Sigma Publishing Co.
The Memories of Dean Hole. New ed. Macmillan, $2.25.
Tristram, W. O. Coaching Days and Coaching Ways. New ed. Macmillan. $2.
Troussart, C. Cœur Fermé. Paris; Armand Colin & Cie.
Waldstein, Charles. The Work of John Ruskin. Harpers. $1.
Walford, L. B. The One Good Guest. Longmans, Green & Co. 50 cents.
Walker, Prof. Williston. The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism. Scribners. $3.50.
Welcker, Adair. Flavia. Berkeley, Cal.: The Author.
Wheatley, H. B. The Diary of Samuel Pepys. Vol. II. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Wheeler, Mrs. Candace. Household Art. [The Distaff Series.] Harpers. $1.
Wiggin, Mrs. Kate D. The Kindergarten. [The Distaff Series.] Harpers. $1.
Wood, Rev. James. Dictionary of Quotations. F. Warne & Co. $2.50.
Wright, M. R. Heat. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.50.

AMERICAN SCIENCE SERIES.

Barker's Physics.	Advanced course.
Remsen's Chemistry.	3 courses.
Packard's Zoology.	3 courses.
Martin's Human Body.	3 courses.
Walker's Political Economy.	3 courses.
Newcomb & Holden's Astronomy.	2 courses.
Bessey's Botany.	2 courses.
James's Psychology.	2 courses.
Sedgwick & Wilson's Biology.	

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

The Medical Department of the Johns Hopkins University will open October 2, 1893. Circulars and further information can be obtained on application to the Registrar of the University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Letters of Credit.

We buy and sell bills of exchange on and make Cable Transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies; also make collections and issue Commercial and Travellers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

AMERICANA.

48-page Catalogue of scarce second-hand books relating to America mailed free on application.

JOSEPH McDONOUGH, Ye Olde Booke Man,
53 and 55 State Street, ALBANY, N. Y.

HATCHARDS.

This is the favorite BOOKSTORE, and for 100 years the resort of the smartest people in London. It is visited and patronized by all who love books. London is the great market for books, and all the best as well as the cheapest editions can be had by writing to us. Special collections formed, and fuller information supplied than from any other house. Books both old and new, and relating to any subject, can readily be supplied at very moderate prices.

Agents for Clubs, Libraries, and all private Collectors.

187 Piccadilly, London, W.

ESTABLISHED 1858

H. H. UPHAM & CO.

MEMORIAL TABLETS

IN BRASS AND BRONZE

54 South Fifth Ave. near Bleecker St

NEW YORK

FINE ORIGINAL PAINTING OF GEORGE WASHINGTON (hitherto unknown). 30 inches by 25. See Catalogue,
FRANK T. SABIN'S
118 SHAFTESBURY AVENUE, LONDON, W.

Indigestion

Horsford's Acid Phosphate

Is the most effective and agreeable remedy in existence for preventing indigestion and relieving those diseases arising from a disordered stomach.

Dr. W. W. Gardner, Springfield, Mass., says: "I value it as an excellent preventative of indigestion, and a pleasant acidulated drink when properly diluted with water and sweetened."

Descriptive Pamphlet free on application to

Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.

For sale by all Druggists.

YALE MIXTURE

The choicest Smoking Tobacco experience can produce or that money can buy.

MARBURG BROS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED